THE Lutheran Quarterly

me V NOVEMBER, 1953 Number 4

Office of Publication, 18 Carlisle Street, Gettysburg, Pa. Entered at the Post Office at Gettysburg, Pa., as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly,* founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review,* founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly,* Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly,* Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Printed by the Times and News Publishing Company, Gettysburg, Pa.

Manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, books for review to the Book Editor, subscriptions to the Circulation Manager.

Subscription $2.75 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents.

Editor
THEODORE G. TAPPERT
7333 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

Managing Editor
A. J. ENGELBRECHT
1250 Nowata St., Dubuque, Iowa

Book Editor
WARREN A. QUANBECK
2245 Luther Place, St. Paul 8, Minnesota

Circulation Manager
PAUL M. LINDBERG
Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Representatives of

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
GETTYSBURG, PA.

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

AUGUSTANA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

CAPITAL UNIVERSITY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
COLUMBUS, OHIO

WARTBURG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
DUBUQUE, IOWA

LUTHER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ST. PAUL, MINN.

AUGSBURG SEMINARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

CENTRAL SEMINARY
FREMONT, NEB.

CHICAGO LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MAYWOOD, ILL.

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN SEMINARY OF CANADA
WATERLOO, ONT.

GRANDVIEW SEMINARY
DES MOINES, IOWA

HAMMA DIVINITY SCHOOL
SPRINGFIELD, OHIO

LUTHERAN SEMINARY
SASKATOON, SASK.

NORTHWESTERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

SOUTHERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
COLUMBIA, S. C.

SUOMI SEMINARY
HANCOCK, MICH.

TRINITY SEMINARY
BLAIR, NEB.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN SEMINARY
BERKELEY, CALIF.

AIMS AND POLICY

I. *Aims:* The aims of this quarterly shall be to provide a forum (1) for the discussion of Christian faith and life on the basis of the Lutheran confession, (2) for the application of the principles of the Lutheran Church to the changing problems of religion and society, (3) for the fostering of world Lutheranism, and (4) for the promotion of understanding between Lutherans and other Christians.

II. *Policy:* The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they be free from controversial animus; and that their contents be of real scholarly and practical value to the readers. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, does not of itself exclude articles from publication since the editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Volume V NOVEMBER, 1953 Number 4

CONTENTS

CHRISTIANITY AND THE ECONOMIC ORDER — *Paul L. Holmer* 331

THE WORD OF GOD IN HUMAN EARS — *Eberhard Mueller* 340

INDIRECTION IN CHRISTIAN EDUCATION — *William M. Horn* 349

NOTES AND STUDIES

Kerygma and Mythos: The Theology of Rudolf Bultmann — *Paul Leo* 359
Luther and Church Government — *G. M. Bruce* 370
Motives for Conversion in the Mission of St. Anskar — *Allen Cabaniss* 378
Justus Falckner's Ordination Certificate — *Willem J. Kooiman* 385
Luther on the Christmas Prophecy, Isaiah 9 — *Carl Umhau Wolf* 388
Wanted: Fire-Brands — *W. O. Doescher* 391
Theology and World Lutheranism — *Vilmos Vajta* 395
The Faculty Christian Fellowship — *Harold A. Dunkelberger* 398

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Nygren, ed., *This is the Church* (E. W. Matzner) 401
Kegley and Bretall, *The Theology of Paul Tillich* (T. A. Kantonen) 401
Dillenberger, *God Hidden and Revealed* (Uuras Saarnivaara) 403
Allbeck, *Studies in Lutheran Confessions* (Uuras Saarnivaara) 404
Bailey, *The Mystery of Love and Marriage* (Harold Haas) 405
Laetsch, *Jeremiah* (Wm. H. Cooper) 406
Mackay, *God's Order. The Ephesian Letter and This Present Time* (Russell D. Snyder) 408
Traina, *Methodical Bible Study* (John Reumann) 410
Clarke, *Concise Bible Commentary* 411
Norberg, *Frikyrklighetens Uppkomst* (Conrad Bergendoff) 411
Internationale Zeitschriftenschau für Bibelwissenschaft (Charles M. Cooper) 412
Wolf *et al.*, ed., *Verkündigung und Forschung* (Theodore G. Tappert) 412
Richardson, ed., *Early Christian Fathers* (J. Knudsen) 412
Richards, *History of the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the U. S., 1825-1934, Evangelical and Reformed Church, 1934-1952* (A. R. Wentz) 413
Herman, *Report from Christian Europe* (Theodore G. Tappert) 414
Haentzschel, *The Great Quest* (Theo. I. Jensen) 415
Blackwood, *Expository Preaching for Today* (Harry F. Baughman) 415
Lehmann, *Heralds of the Gospel* (T. F. Gullixson) 416
Lundquist, *Lives that Glorify God* 417
Atkinson, *The Beauty of Holiness* (W. D. Allbeck) 417
Eavey, *The Art of Effective Teaching* (R. D. Heim) 418
Liemohn, *The Chorale Through Four Hundred Years of Musical Development as a Congregational Hymn* (Ulrich S. Leupold) 418
Nordin, *The Choirmaster's Workbook, Volume 3* (Albert A. Jagnow) 419
Wallis, *The Funeral Encyclopedia* (Henry H. Bagger) 419
20 Funeral Sermons (Henry H. Bagger) 420
Marney, *These Things Remain* (Edmund A. Steimle) 420
Youngdahl, *A House for Tomorrow* (Edmund A. Steimle) 421
Anderson, *Young China in the Valley of Decision* (Francis E. Reinberger) 421
Barton, *The Sage and the Olive* (P. H. Buehring) 421
Allis, *Revised Version or Revised Bible?* (E. E. Flack) 422
Lindeskog, *Studien zum neutestamentlichen Schöpfungsgedanken I,* (Eric H. Wahlstrom) 423

CONTRIBUTORS

PAUL L. HOLMER is associate professor of Philosophy in the University o Minnesota.

EBERHARD MUELLER is director of the *Evangelische Akademie* in Bad Bol Württemberg, and author of *Wir Glauben die Wahrheit* (Tübingen, 1948), chapter of which is here translated by Gustav K. Wiencke.

WILLIAM M. HORN is a member of the editorial staff of the Board of Paris Education of the United Lutheran Church and lives in Philadelphia.

PAUL LEO is professor of the New Testament in Wartburg Theological Sem inary, Dubuque, Iowa.

G. M. BRUCE is professor emeritus in Luther Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesot

ALLEN CABANISS is professor of History in the University of Mississippi.

WILLEM J. KOOIMAN is professor of Church History in the University o Amsterdam, Holland.

CARL UMHAU WOLF is pastor of St. Paul Lutheran Church, Toledo, Ohio.

W. O. DOESCHER is professor of Philosophy and dean of the faculty in Capita University, Columbus, Ohio.

VILMOS VAJTA is director of the newly established Department of Theolog of the Lutheran World Federation and has his office in Geneva, Switzerland.

HAROLD A. DUNKELBERGER is associate professor of Bible in Gettysburg Col lege, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.

Among the reviewers of books in this issue are W. D. ALLBECK, professor o Church History in the Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio; H. H. BAGGE president of the Philadelphia Seminary; H. F. BAUGHMAN, president of the Get tysburg Seminary; CONRAD BERGENDOFF, president of Augustana College, Roc Island, Ill.; P. H. BUEHRING, professor of Church History in the Theologica Seminary of Capital University, Columbus, Ohio; C. M. COOPER, president of th Ministerium of Pennsylvania; W. H. COOPER, professor of the Old Testament i the Northwestern Theological Seminary, Minneapolis, Minn.; E. E. FLACK, dea of Hamma Divinity School; T. F. GULLIXSON, president of Luther Seminary St. Paul, Minn.; R. D. HEIM, professor of Christian Education in the Gettysbur Seminary; A. A. JAGNOW, professor of Church History in Wartburg Seminary Dubuque, Iowa; T. I. JENSEN, dean of Trinity Seminary, Blair, Neb.; T. A KANTONEN, professor of Systematic Theology in the Hamma Divinity School E. W. MATZNER, professor of Systematic Theology in Wartburg Seminary; F. E REINBERGER, professor of Practical Theology in the Gettysburg Seminary; R. D SNYDER, professor of the New Testament in the Philadelphia Seminary; E. A STEIMLE, professor of Practical Theology in the Philadelphia Seminary; E. H WAHLSTROM, professor of the New Testament in Augustana Seminary, Rock Is land, Ill.; A. R. WENTZ, professor of Church History in the Gettysburg Seminary

Christianity and the Economic Order

By Paul L. Holmer

MODERN economic science is distinguished for having discovered techniques and procedures by which men may now describe some of the actual relations, structures, and behavior that can be termed economic. Markets, prices, the role of money, and numerous related and familiar phenomena can now be skillfully and intelligibly described. That this is an achievement, I believe no student can deny. The worth of such an achievement is another matter. As is the case with all knowledge, the importance of economic science is not completely intrinsic. To the man who wants to know, knowledge is the satisfaction of a want and possesses a value accordingly. For example, knowledge of the past is significant, not to everyone, but primarily to those who need to know in order that they achieve satisfaction. For such persons historical knowledge is an intrinsic good and its pursuit needs no further validation. And likewise with economic science. Economics (as with all sciences) aims to discriminate truth about a subject matter, and truth for some persons is a good irrespective of the pleasure it brings, the uses to which it can be put, or the advantage it may bring the possessor.

It is not my intent to discuss the merits of economic science. As an effort of human beings it is marred by all kinds of absurdities. The lunatics can never be fenced in. One will find economists making absurd claims for their discipline, just as one will find theologians proposing their science as God's knowledge of man rather than man's knowledge of God. Certain recent minor successes have produced flourishes among economists that are strikingly unbecoming. Claims as to the importance of a discipline must always be tempered by awareness that there are rival dynasties in universities and colleges as well as everywhere else. But this is not to cast aspersions upon learning or any form of it. Economics aims to become a neutral body of learning, the perfection of which would inhere in the fact that it would not dictate its own use nor presuppose anything idiosyncratic in the learner.

Any body of knowledge may be a tool for the spiritual life of a man, and the efficacy of knowledge for religious uses is directly proportionate to the extent to which one learns about oneself. But knowledge is neither a temptation from nor an aid to the spiritual life for most of us. And certainly this is obvious in respect to economic science; for most of us find it so difficult to grasp that we never find a prerogative to discuss its religious significance. However, everyone finds it necessary to live his life in an economic order. And a Christian wrestles with money and banks, he accounts for his assets and seeks credit, he buys and sells, he incurs debts, and he profits when others lose. It is preoccupation with the world and its economy that will concern us here and not preoccupation with the science of economics.

I

There are various levels of economic organization in every society. Some groups of persons whom we term uncivilized are distinguished for their lack of organizational devices. Most of us would never exchange lack of organization for organization, and certainly the advances of a civilization can be measured in terms of the invention of organizational techniques. In the course of history law has replaced lawlessness, and every person with ethical perspicuity realizes immediately that the restraint of law upon individual freedom is at the same time the discipline that gives us our greatest freedoms. Just as minds free to wander are most captive to fancies and vagaries, so men without law are victimized by brutes and captured by their own particularity. As much as all of us may regret some aspects of government and law, we are quite content to define lawlessness as a kind of evil and to apply sanctions against those who do not obey. Submission to norms which are in fact national, and which we hope are in principle of universal applicability, is a virtue. Few men would have it otherwise. To be law-abiding is a goal for individual endeavor, and much of the popular repute of ethical and religious culture is gained by the fact that such cultivation stimulates the desires for allegiance to standards.

Within any group of people there are some who wish to be self-assertive. Rightness and wrongness are seldom accredited to individual desires unless that desire is compatible with an agreed upon norm. And it takes a wide variety of devices in any society to inform, to persuade

to command, or even to force its members to yield their particularity to the will of a majority or to any defined common good. There are persons who either do not recognize that it is wrong to be assertive against the law or who, if they do so recognize, do not act in accord with such awareness. Such persons stand to be improved morally by becoming conscious of the intent of law. Biblical literature identifies the law as a manifestation of the will of God. This is a way of saying that God is to be identified with the pursuit of the moral and legal good rather than with the pursuit of either evil or lawlessness.

All of this is well articulated in documents of religion and government. "Rights" which have to be discovered and defined by conventions of men are declared to be "endowments" of the Creator, and the articulation of order and the securing of peace by legislative act are always deemed a victory over the powers of evil. But the elements of economic order and the devices, perfected through long and tortuous history, by which exchange has become possible are seldom considered in the same light. Yet it certainly must be acknowledged that a civilization is superior when it has procedures by which one man can get from another peacefully what is his surplus. A man who disregards such devices is also one who fails to contribute to intercourse for mutual profit. The man with a poor credit rating is perhaps morally reprobate. And the man who is always in debt, and whose debts are never alleviated by prosperity, is perhaps in the position to be taught by the very system he subverts.

Just as law-abiding behavior is stimulated by belief in God, so a certain kind of behavior within the economic system may perhaps be encouraged by a religious life. The prudential use of money and habitual saving are typical economic virtues. Though both of these are difficult to define, this general point may still be made: God's will cannot easily be identified with economic profligacy and squandering of one's possessions. Even though we have long assented to the banal form given such "virtues" by superficial admonition, most of us are quite startled by an overt statement that these are also God's will. But just as law is to mutual advantage, so is an economic system to everyone's advantage. And if we argue that God is not on the side of lawlessness but on the side of norms, so we ought to argue that the development of an economic system must be a positive good, and insofar as God is good, so God may be an agent producing economic order.

To argue this in another form, suppose that one admits with the majority of people in the Western world that economic independence is a legitimate goal. Suppose, also, that there are correlations worked out to show that getting and keeping a job, saving one's money, wise investments, budgeting, etc. are ways of securing financial independence. Within the system of our economy, most of us would certainly agree that the end proposed is desirable and that the person who did not so desire was in some degree reprobate. The possibility that God's will should be understood to accord with what is mutually profitable is always a moot one. And I expect that most Christians and Jews have, in the absence of the ability to believe that God is a reckless spender, inferred immediately that their religion legitimately motivates the prudential economic virtues.

This raises a most interesting question. As students of our problems of selfhood, we learn very soon that not all wishes can be fulfilled. In succeeding to maturation every person must learn the prudence by which to adjust the competing claims of his passions. And, in addition, when one must live in proximity to others, still further adaptations must be made. For better or for worse, what we call good and evil, right and wrong, are reflections of this fact. There is a kind of religion in the world which says that such a *good* is God's will. This religion argues its own survival value on the grounds that it provides the motivation for the pursuit of the good within the orders of social life rather than the pursuit of evil or the abnegation of concern about either good or evil. This is the essence of tribal religion. But tribal religion is not geographically or temporally confined. Whenever a religion is defended as the bond of social cohesion, that religion, whether it is Christian or anything else in name, is of the tribal variety. This is not to deny such a religion significance. For long and continuing testimony can be cited to show that religion serves as an agent of acculturation.

When persons argue that it is Christianity which has made America great, they undoubtedly mean to note that Christianity has encouraged enterprise, has softened human manners, has made people anxious to improve, etc. And within social life we frequently note the sluggard who in his sheer obtuseness could profit economically from a little shot of religion. But because religion, and even Christianity, does produce economic enterprise, it is certainly not proper to define it by

its economic by-products. To do so would mean to define Christianity as a tribal religion and to leave out everything of the strenuousness and vivacity that one would find in recapitulating the experiences of St. Paul.

II

To acknowledge right and wrong within the orbit of a legal system is an achievement for all persons and is an achievement over the niggardliness which identifies the good always and only with personal preferences. Likewise, it takes maturation and personal seriousness to find and maintain responsibility within an economic system. But to wrestle with right and wrong within a system is not the same as to wrestle with the whole system. Tribal religion is a social endeavor of men to encourage the pursuit of good within a system. One then needs kings as protectors of faith and oaths of religious allegiance—and, above all, conformity and unanimity. These become the charismatic virtues. But personal religion defines the world as the enemy. It is not evil within the system, but the system itself which is at enmity with the human spirit. It seems necessary, however, to note that the strenuous spiritual combat here noted does not negate the distinction between good and evil, legally defined; rather, it proposes that being good is not to be saved. This is, I believe, one way to interpret Christianity and the relations between it and law and culture.

While Christianity and Judaism are in conflict, they are nevertheless supplementary. For Jesus claims to fulfill the law of Judaism while yet denying its ultimacy. This is to say that the redemption of the self, understood in Christian terms, is not simply a matter of becoming reconciled to the good within the systems of human existence. To believe in the existence of God in the context of Christianity demands great daring. It asks not that one disparage all order but that one pursue order rather than disorder and yet not pit one's life upon it. The God of Jesus Christ is love and not prudence. He is neither good nor evil; he is holy. This is an invitation to men that suggests that they can be defined by the existence of truth, holiness, and love, and that these are what God is. To sell out to economic independence, security, and an honest wage may be godly acts and may even lead to a promised land. But Christianity promises no land to the dispossessed. Rather than

asking that individual desire be checked by the desires and the good of the many, Christianity seems to check both in relation to God.

But all of this must be carefully stated, for all too frequently each individual finds great satisfaction in a quietism that appears more Christian than ethical and economic striving. One must be careful, too, lest the issues be so stated that the question becomes one of striving for a better standard of living for others rather than myself. Then Christianity becomes an altruism within the system rather than an egoism within the system. Once again, then, Christianity becomes the right way within the system as over against the wrong way. As easy as it is to say this, every Christian would perhaps hesitate saying that the positive efforts to achieve cheapness and to avoid unnecessary efforts are not great and religious efforts. The world is one of scarcity, and all must choose. To live with prudence is to live. To live without some kind of prudence is to die. A high standard of living means more people dying later and with less pain, and a low standard of living means more people dying sooner and with more pain. It is no wonder, then, that with a standard of living for all people being a result of a long history of struggle, religious significance is attached to the enterprise of overcoming.

But this may be the crucial point. To speak about a standard of living as if it were the defining characteristic of God's revelation in Christ is to convert Christianity into a tribal religion, and perhaps an American tribal religion. Perhaps most of us do not understand the meaning of giving up the world unless we also face the concrete fact that "the world" for us comes as "a standard of living." Dying later and with less pain is preferable to dying sooner and with more pain, and this distinction need not be abrogated nor its significance to my preferences in any wise denied. But Christianity may ask us to trade our preferences, too, for eternal life!

This conflict in value judgments is seen when some religious reformers have argued the superiority of agrarian and rural life over urban and industrial life. And one gets the impression from this kind of religiosity that general economic backwardness is a religious advantage. Or again, the easy identification of free enterprise with God's will and "governmental interference" on the part of man as something less than God's will—this, too, puts the will of God within the pref-

erential. It certainly must be the case that Christianity can never be completely identified with either a past phase of our economic history or a future possibility immanent in our present system.

III

All of this implies that we must be subtle if we wish to understand ourselves as would-be Christians. The ease with which Christian churches reward the prudent and the rich shows how easily Christianity decays into a tribal religion. Success within the world rather than success against it becomes a Christian criterion. And the sectarian, fundamentalist churches are no different here from the Catholic or Reformation bodies. Perhaps this suggests, too, that religious teaching is shoddy and that the concept of the "world" is mightily confused. The ultimate conflict between the economic order in which we live and Christianity is not between secular and churchly economics. No, both of these are alike.

The economic order exists because of scarcity and, correlatively, because human needs are indeterminate. If the needs of men were determinate, satisfactions would come relatively easy. The needs would not change before the satisfactions begin to come as they now do. But, the truth of the matter is that needs do change and hence that satisfactions are only temporary. The dissatisfaction of men is also the root of religion. Men are born to seek—and in not seeking there is no possibility of finding God. Satisfaction is both religious damnation and the end of an economy

The indeterminateness of human needs is the occasion for continued productivity. Because needs are in flux, the demands of men vary. One of the axioms of the business world is that where there is a demand one can sell a supply. With no demand there can be no sale. Therefore, we live in a world where men must for the sake of *economic* good, for the sake of a standard of living, for the sake of more for everybody, create demands and needs. While all of this is called *development,* and while we speak of raising a people's standard of living, it is also expedient to note that all of this is financially profitable. This is why so many persons distrust the ethics of business. Economic activity is invariably stimulated when a standard of living is invoked, and it takes very little cynicism indeed to impute economic motives to those who

advocate in ethical—and sometimes religious—categories what does prove to be financially profitable.

But here the Christian life conflicts in principle with what is an assumed practice in the world. It is not by multiplying one's needs that one saves oneself. Christianly speaking, it is by learning that one thing is needful, and not many, that we approach God. The stimulation that the world gives a person may lead only to the acquisition of *impedimenta.* And the things of the world, possessions, a standard of living, etc., may be actual *impedimenta.* They may be encumbrances, real weights, that keep one from eternal life. Or, if they are not weighty in themselves, the needs for them may be. In any case, where Christianity seeks to simplify our demands and needs, the economic order seeks to satisfy them and create new ones. And it is no answer to say that we only need food, clothing, and shelter when the problem is to learn that we *need* only God.

The sinfulness of the world does not inhere in the satisfactions we get from having needs placated. The things, or whatever fulfills desire, are not intrinsically wrong. To have an unsatisfied desire is to have a need—and this is usually called evil or privation in the economic world. To have the want satisfied is the good economic systems aim at. And as was noted previously, some persons are motivated by religion to the noble end of learning to satisfy the wants of others instead of only their own. For example, during World War I some religious bodies were accused by American churchmen of irreligion and evil because their workers gave cigarettes to wounded soldiers. My point is that privation of cigarettes with the existence of the want is an evil for the one with the want for a cigarette, and also for the man who makes them and stands to profit by reaching a consumer.

The sinfulness of the world and ourselves inheres in our complicity in a system where the greatest need goes unrecognized and where *other needs* are determinative for the self. The economic order creates and perpetuates a panoply of needs. Evil, Christianly understood, is a characteristic of men and not things, of selves and not objects. To be evil, *Christianly,* is so to live as not to need God. Neither poverty nor plenty, though the difference between them be large, can describe the ultimate need or the ultimate satisfaction. For this reason the *welfare* of men is a most religious concern. "Welfare," like "plenty" and a

"standard of living," is a concept, the meaning of which must change as needs change. And as an economy prospers, this is very often. Against this is the Christian conception of *welfare* which connotes salvation or finding God. To be in the world but not of it connotes here being physically in an economic order without having one's needs defined by it. To discover one's need for God when few do—and certainly not the many who are so satisfied by the economic order—is the sign that one is coming into the selfhood that is like that of an apostle.

The Word of God in Human Ears

By Eberhard Mueller

IF WE would know the truth, we must have open eyes for reality. If we would know God and find the way to him, we must open our ears and allow God's Word to penetrate to our heart. God and truth can only co-exist; hence we must seek God with open eyes and ears.

I

Any unbiased glance into the Bible reveals that it is not a book which has fallen from heaven. Human hands wrote it, and they wrote it in the terms of a certain age. Its authors subscribed to the cosmology of antiquity—the earth in the center and the sun following a path across the firmament. Schemes of the universe such as this one of biblical times have proved human and transient.

Great portions of the Bible are accounts of historical events. Human beings experienced them, human memory recalled them and retold them, and human hands wrote them down. The capabilities of these men were not divinely perfect. Not a single biblical author claims such perfection for his writing. There are differing accounts of many biblical events in the Scriptures, and their details do not agree. It is plain that these variations are due to variations in human observation and memory. In the Pentateuch various accounts are blended together, but the seams can be discovered in certain inconsistencies. One well known and popular example, once much used by free-thinkers, is the unsettled question of the origin of Cain's wife. The previous chapter (Gen. 4:17) does not explain her existence.

In the New Testament, the four gospel accounts were not woven together, but assembled into separate books, though in part dependent upon one another. The ancient church rightly presumed that having several varying accounts of the same event does not cast doubt upon the reliability of the whole account, but rather confirms the event. Still, the ancient church had a naïve disregard for the human imperfection of these accounts.

A number of biblical narratives, such as the book of Job, do not pretend to be historical accounts. Rather the author clothes certain of his religious experiences and even his theological perceptions in narrative form. In other portions of the Bible the purpose of the author is in doubt. One of the major questions is whether biblical narrative is historical account or parable, as, for example, in the book of Jonah. The historical background is not certain for all parts of the Bible. Indeed, some passages plainly evidence a mixture of biblical faith in God with pagan ideas and rites. In their despair, men of the Bible mingled unholy passions even with their prayers, as in Psalm 137.

Moreover, we do not possess the original manuscript of any book of the Bible. Even the oldest manuscripts are copies and differ from one another in many small details, especially in difficult passages where the copyist tried to make the text more understandable. A scientific, comparative study of the manuscripts has succeeded in most cases in recovering the original text with fair certainty. But we possess no perfect copy of the biblical writings.

This fact makes it plain that the so-called doctrine of verbal inspiration does not correspond with reality. This doctrine makes the assertion that the Bible is God's Word in the sense that God eliminated the human weaknesses and mistakes of the authors and dictated the text for them to write down. Though this doctrine contradicts the opinion which the biblical authors held concerning their own writing, it is nevertheless still upheld by some in the church.

This doctrine of verbal inspiration not only contradicts biblical fact; it also contradicts the spirit of Christian faith. A basic conviction of Christendom is that God, though almighty, does not set aside man or ignore his personality and independence by making him a docile tool of his autocratic will. Christian faith is vitally convinced that God is at work in the history of imperfect, sinful men, albeit men who are led by his Spirit to faith. Thus it is no doctrine of the Christian faith that the "work of the Holy Spirit" extinguishes all human peculiarities and imperfections, but rather that he, as Luther's Catechism puts it, "calls, gathers, enlightens, sanctifies, and preserves in the one, true faith."

The revelation of God in this world takes place not in a collection of timeless, divine communications and precepts which man could utilize as a "God between the covers of a book," or as an infallible medicine

cabinet, or an eternally valid law book. No, God reveals himself in the history of living men. Only he who approaches this history as a living person can discover in and behind it the history of divine revelation.

The doctrine of verbal inspiration has had fateful consequences in the Christian church. It has imperilled the meaning of Scriptures for the living faith of the church. Since the many contradictions in the Bible were known to the defenders of this doctrine, they resorted to the allegorical method of interpretation in order to discover a secret and allegedly spiritual meaning behind the literal sense of a passage, even when this hidden meaning had not been put there by the biblical author. The consequence was that biblical interpretation was no longer bound to the literal meaning but could put any desired meaning into the Bible passage. Seemingly, great homage was paid to the Bible. It was placed upon satin cushions and honored as a divine book. In reality, the Bible was often deprived of its real power and meaning. The allegorical method, so essential to the doctrine of verbal inspiration, did not submit to the Word of Holy Scripture as it claimed to do. Instead it hid the Bible behind a halo of divinity and loaded it down with the arbitrary ideas of its interpreters.

Only where the human side of the Bible is taken seriously and seen with open eyes does the divine meaning become effective. Our problem is, How are we to perceive the divine meaning in this human form?

II

There are times when a radio speech or announcement becomes decisive in the destiny of a nation or our personal life. When the speaker's voice comes out of the loudspeaker, static or the limitations of the radio receiver may distort it. Obviously, it is not the speaker's own voice that we hear, but a transmitted voice. Listeners with very sensitive ears might refuse to listen to the loudspeaker, but there are circumstances when we do not care. We only want to find out in any way possible what that fateful message means for us. So we forget the static and the garbled noises as we listen.

Those who earnestly listen in the Bible for the Word which promises to explain the meaning, destiny, and purpose of their lives have a similar experience. It matters little to them when the scientific

expert points out mistakes or distortions in details of the transmission of the divine Word. The only concern is a passionate desire to find out whether God is speaking and what he has to say.

To put it precisely, we might say that the Bible is not God's immediate Word, but a human copy of it. Men like Isaiah and Jeremiah speak in human words about what God has revealed to them. Historians report past events and describe the effect of God's Word in human individuals or in a nation. The evangelists—Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John—report concerning the Word of God which they have "seen and heard" (I John 1:1) in Jesus Christ, whom they call the incarnate Word of God. Epistle writers of the apostolic age put into writing that Word of God which rose out of their experience in meeting Christ and which in their preaching became God's Word to the people of their time.

In the Christian view, the Bible is a human reproduction, imperfect like everything human and yet repeatedly acknowledged in the human heart as the Word through which God makes his will known to man, shows him his way, and delivers his soul from a thousand troubles.

The humanness of the Bible is not sufficient reason for doubting the church's doctrine of the Word of God. At most it may offend the faith of those who approach the Bible with a bias and suppose that it could be God's Word only if it is God's immediate word for them and if it is as infallible as God's omniscience itself. But whether such a word of God could be understood at all is doubtful. We are able to understand only human speech. Human speech about God always uses symbols and metaphors drawn from the narrow range of our human experience and mentality. How could such words be vessels large enough for all the richness of the divine essence!

When we want to make something understandable for children, we have to adapt ourselves to their own ideas lest we talk over their heads. Thus God speaks to man in the concepts and language of the particular era. This does not mean that when children grow up their concepts need not be cleansed and their thought world need not grow. Such cleansing and growth may be observed in the Bible itself. Its authors differed in level of education. But all of them were fully convinced that, no matter how great our growth in scientific knowledge and experience, we would still remain as children toward God and his Word. We would still only stammer rather than speak about God's eternal and unalterable Word.

St. Paul compares the stamped image of God in our earthly words with the original pattern which we shall see in eternity: "For now we see in a mirror, darkly; but then fact to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know fully even as also I was fully known."

Proud of our learning, we like to point out what towering advance we have made beyond the naive ideas of antiquity. This pride deafens our ears to the voice of God which speaks to us in these old stories.

When Christ spoke to Pilate about his eternal kingdom, addressing that Roman who imagined himself so superior, he said simply: "Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end have I been born, and to this end am I come into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice." Jesus means that not everyone hears the voice of truth—God's Word—when it is spoken. Only he hears it who belongs to the truth, who has truly surrendered to the truth in order to perceive it.

Pilate was not eager to do this. For him Jesus was an interesting legal case for investigation. Pilate was occupied with the political problem of how to settle the case without conflict with the influential Jews. To follow up the analogy of the radio, when Pilate saw Jesus, the Word of God, before him, he had tuned his receiver to another wave length, to another station than the one whose radio waves came from above, from the Lord of life. Thus he heard the shouting voices outside, and the voice of his own reason, so offended by the wretched appearance of Jesus, drowned out the voice of God which summoned him to be a courageous, just judge and to worship the divine. That divine voice, seeking to reach Pilate's ear, was strong enough to disturb him, however. Even critical readers of the Bible can seldom fully escape its power, though it fails to convince them as long as the Voice from on high is drowned out by the bustling and self-confident voices of those who have not understood their ultimate need for God.

We should not lose ourselves in pious feelings, forgetting our need for sharp, precise thinking. We realize that God and truth must co-exist and that we dare not neglect critical thinking in our surrender to hearing and obeying God's voice. How can we be sure that God is here speaking to us? We saw that in every case much that is human mingles with the divine in the Bible. What is the norm by which we can dis-

tinguish the divine Voice from the voices of men? A more radical question would be: Can there be a human standard for the divine?

If we could find such a standard in the realm of human reason, we would have no basic need for God's revelation. We would need it only in the way we need a textbook in mathematics for learning the laws of that science. That is, we would need it as an introduction, a shortcut to a fuller knowledge which we could otherwise achieve all by ourselves, though more slowly and painfully. We would use it gratefully, like the path conveniently marked out for us by a previous climber of a mountain peak. But no spiritual mountain climber has ever surmounted God. His Word is known to us only when it reaches us like a sunbeam and strikes our eye.

Martin Luther answers our question by saying, "This is the true test for criticising all books [of the Bible]—whether they proclaim Christ or not, for all Scriptures point to Christ, and St. Paul resolved to know nothing but Christ. Whatever does not teach Christ is not apostolic [hence not God's Word] even though it is a word of St. Peter or Paul."[1] In another passage Luther says, "It is not enough to say, 'Luther, Peter, or Paul said so,' but you must feel it in your conscience, you must solidly experience Christ himself, to know that it is God's Word. . . . As long as you do not have this feeling, you surely have not yet tasted God's Word."[2]

According to Luther there is no standard by which we can determine externally what in the Bible is God's Word. Even the greatest authorities in matters of faith and scientific knowledge cannot grant us that certainty. Only Christ can give it to us, which is to say that it comes ultimately from God himself. This difficulty is unavoidable if the Bible conveys more than human voices.

Is there, then, no standard for certainty? The Roman Catholic Church believes that it possesses such a standard in the tradition of the church and in the infallibility of the pope. Hence it fosters a childlike trust in "Mother Church" as the first step toward faith. But have not these doctrinal authorities often failed, and was not the Reformation necessary precisely because they failed so tragically in that age?

1 Erlangen edition, LXIII, p. 157.
2 Weimar edition, X, 2, 22.

III

God's Word, if taken seriously, must needs lay claim to the highest authority. We can arrive at certainty as to what God's Word is and says only by simple, sincere, diligent inward preparedness to listen to this Word. As we listen we learn to recognize God's Word and "his Spirit testifies along with our spirit" (Rom. 8:16).

An example may make the point clear. Over the telephone other voices may be heard on the wire. During the war we often noticed in our military phones how three or four other conversations could be picked up in the background whenever we made a long-distance call. How could one distinguish the right voice? We could not correct the wiring, but an experienced operator could learn to listen to the voice which was speaking to him, even though other voices might sound louder.

Thus we have to learn to listen to God's voice. One must learn to recognize his voice in the way one learns to know the voice of a loved one in a deeply inward meeting of heart with heart. Lovers know that at such moments they become capable of distinguishing any false note even when the voice of the loved one gives words an appearance of sincerity.

That is what Luther means when he says that what does not proclaim Christ is not "apostolic" even if from the lips of Paul or Peter. The final certainty that God is speaking to us can be granted to us only by God himself when his divine "I" is bound to our human "I" in love.

In desperation we ask whether this means that it is entirely up to the personal notions of an individual as to what he regards as God's Word. Cannot we at least test whether we have rightly heard God's voice by comparison with others who are also listening to God? To a certain extent that is possible. He who truly hears God's Word will be led into the fellowship of believers in the church. He will practice this listening to God's voice daily and seek to understand any Bible verse in the whole context of Scripture, and what has become clear to his conscience he will relate to the consciences of others who listen to God's Word. The love of God is not exclusive like the marriage tie. That love is ours only if we listen to one another in love and mutual sympathy. Since, however, we can recognize God's love only when the spirit of God opens itself to our spirit in love, sectarian exclusiveness can never

fully understand it. Only truly ecumenical love, including all the children of God, can hear when it listens.

But we are still faced with the problem of words. What do we mean when we talk about God, about Christ, or about the church? Are these not themselves very human words and ideas whose validity is questioned so much among us?

We cannot avoid using these words because we must clearly understand that we cannot measure the Word of God with any external standards or intellectual devices. God's Word can be measured only by God himself and by him whom God's love has accepted and bound to himself.

Must we then await some kind of supernatural experience and enlightenment, perhaps even a so-called conversion? What if we cannot escape critical questions even during or after such experiences—wondering whether they are hallucinations, illusions, or fantasies, explainable in some natural way? Are we not caught in a dilemma when we establish on the one hand that we can possess no norm for distinguishing God's Word and on the other hand that we must nevertheless learn to distinguish the Voice from the voices we hear? We are not caught in a dilemma if we have become genuine listeners. Instead of many words, let a simple example make this point clear.

As we get out of the train in the Swiss Alps, we ask a native, "Where is the Matterhorn?" Perhaps it is a foggy day and the native points in a direction where we can see nothing. If we are stupid, we answer indignantly, "That can't be it because I cannot see anything." Then the native might answer, "Well, I can't pick up the Matterhorn and set it before you, and I can't blow the fog away either. But just follow this path. Go along it for the short way that you can see in the fog, then you'll see another stretch. Keep on going and you'll find out whether I told you the truth."

We can give no other answer to him who seeks in the Bible for certainty about the reality of God and the truth of his Word. We cannot grasp God and set him before the seeker. Should we try to give evidence for the divine, we would make God's greatness appear ridiculous. Nor can we dispel the fog behind which God veils his majesty from the inquisitive eyes of curious but sinful men. We can only say, "This is the path. Look at what is said here, and if anything of it is clear to

you, do not regard your knowledge with self-congratulatory joy. Don' remain grouchily seated in the waiting room of doubt just becaus everything is not clear to you. Don't just show that bit of path whic you see to someone else, but follow it yourself, no matter what it costs The price may be high at times. There is also a certain risk in fol lowing that path when one cannot see the end. In the fog of uncertainty another bit of the path will become clear. Follow it, and as you g on, be certain that the reality of the Majestic One himself will loom u in outline. There will be moments when the fog lifts and the su warms and brightens the way. If the fog descends again, you kno that you are on the path. That is enough."

The people of the Bible followed no other path. This is God' way with man. Man must actually walk that path through life's realities It cannot be done in a library with a good map. One has to risk one' life on that path, and that because God is a real God, not just an idea Because God is Lord, it cannot be otherwise.

Indirection in Christian Education

By William M. Horn

THERE seems to be a vast unexplored area of Christian education that might be called the area of exposure or indirection. No one close to the mental or spiritual or social growth of a child would deny its place and even its power. Indeed, it is so evident that one wonders that more attention is not given to it in educational circles. Perhaps the reason is that it is so difficult to chart and measure and test. It cannot be controlled because it involves associations and stages of development that can differ almost as widely as the differences among human beings. One cannot tell where or when or how or why any education is taking place there, so many are the imponderables involved.

Where Christian Education Takes Place

It might be worthwhile to stop for a moment and ask just where Christian education actually takes place. What functions and activities of a congregation bear upon Christian training? At once you can see that they cannot be limited to what we have commonly thought of as the educational agencies of the congregation—the church schools and catechetical classes and organizations with an educational program. You could call these the activities for controlled, direct education; but they may not even be the educational force most impressive upon a child's life. And even within these more direct educational agencies there are often by-products that are not controlled or intended: the educational value of belonging to a group, the power of personal example, the training in group thinking, the power of an atmosphere either cordial or hostile to Christian growth. These are some of the imponderables even within what we consider to be fairly controlled educational agencies.

Perhaps an illustration can draw this out a bit. I often marvel at the success of our church schools in view of all the handicaps most church schools have to overcome. Teaching staffs are spotty in competence and regularity and interest. The sum total of formal training for a child might be as high as 30 to 50 hours a year, with vast

gaps of hours between sessions. The setting for teaching is far from satisfactory—you can have wonderful discussions about self-control when there is no occasion to go off the deep end; you can make great points of loving neighbors who are not there, of being brave under fire when the fire certainly is not in the session itself. In view of all the obstacles church schools must face and put up with, it is surprising that there should be much growth at all.

Yet, when a boy who has been a discipline problem from the nursery through intermediate departments, the kind that every teacher is relieved to pass on to the next teacher—when such a boy returns to church on his one Sunday home on furlough and calls this *his* Sunday school and *his* church, something has happened that no one could possibly foresee. It certainly was not because of the materials he studied or the controlled attitudes he was taught to develop. It was due to one of those intangibles which we might here call the power of indirection. In his case it was the knowledge that someone cared enough for him to put up with him when his own parents would not. How much Bible he knew, how much of the life of Christ he remembered would probably flunk him in most examinations; but he had come toward the goal that we cherish for all education—a sense of commitment and a sense of belonging, to the degree of being a rather potent factor in his life. And it all came about through uncharted indirection.

So it is that within even those areas that we think of as distinctly educational, something happens which we do not chart or put in lesson guides or teach in lesson materials.

But education takes place in a good many areas we may not think of as primarily educational at all. It takes place in worship—in active participation in the liturgy, in listening to Gospel and Epistle, in joining in the Creed, in listening to the sermon. It takes place just by being in church—a kind of osmosis or exposure to the influence of an atmosphere breathing with Christian symbolism, Christian heroism, Christian art. The very architecture and adornment of a church building have bearing on Christian education.

It takes place through music. Sometimes quite directly too. I recall a fine high school principal saying that he learned more of the Bible through singing in a boys' choir than he did in all his Sunday school training. We remember what we sing far longer than we remember

what we learned by pacing the floor with a bit of paper in our hand for prompting purposes. The Chinese are on to that, using music as a common technique for memorizing. But, even apart from learning great Bible passages set to music, participation in singing great hymns and anthems has a strong link with Christian education.

I have not mentioned what is to many the strongest force in indirect Christian training which the church has to offer—the strength of the Christian fellowship. Because of this, there are few areas of Christian activity within a congregation which do *not* have a strong educational tinge. It is learning by doing together—and the thing that is done together may have no Christian significance whatever, but the togetherness in doing it in a Christian fellowship will have deep Christian meaning. We make a mistake in thinking that the activity itself must be educational. It could be working on a church supper or taking part in a church social or sitting as a committee on statistics or watching a ball game; but so long as the bond is one of a common Christian fellowship, there are bound to be educational results.

All this may be one reason why the educational interests of the church seem to be so broad and sweeping—one reason for the suspicion that there are some who would like to put practically all the work of the church under the general heading of Christian education. The power of indirection is such that you cannot draw a bold line between what is educational and what is not, within the church's program. And that may be one reason why there are points of friction within our church between those charged with educational supervision and those charged with supervision of, let us say, evangelism or missions or worship.

What we learn by indirection may be far more controlling than what we learn by the formal, direct, controlled type of learning we associate with Christian parish education. And, while there are continued efforts to bring more of indirection into charted patterns, we will always be faced with what cannot be charted or channeled. With all our studies in the field of the psychology of learning, with all our efforts to control associations, we must recognize the place and the power of this uncharted field.

What does a boy think of when he sees the interlocking rings on a church hymnboard? Memorial to Ballantine? As a growing boy I

was intrigued by the letters IHS on the altar and pulpit hangings—it seemed like a fitting tribute to my prospective alma mater, Ithaca High School. And even now, amid all the false associations with the symbolism of IHS, I am not sure that mine is not as good as the others. Chi-rho at first glance sometimes looks like the symbol of a prescription—especially when there is faulty embroidery. And I need not enter into that vast, uncharted area of associations with some of the Epistles and Gospels for the church year—associations that have come, not because of any obscurity in the language, but because of some experience or background that we have brought to the listening to them on a particular Sunday. Or associations with certain parts of the Service—like an organist I had who thought the councilmen who went to the balcony to count heads at the time of the offering went up there to make sure every person put something in the plate!

These are merely symbolic of the place and power of indirection. They are on the surface level; but some of these associations affect living on a far deeper level, and can become controlling of attitude and character; and it is there that the problem becomes infinitely more acute.

Uncontrolled Associations in the Home

With all this by way of a backdrop, we might explore just one area where indirection operates and where its place deserves considerable attention—the training of the home.

One of the more pressing problems in Christian education today is how to make the home more a power in Christian training than it is. There is no use lamenting the habit of the home's turning Christian training over to the church. In 1879 an editorial appeared in *The Augsburg Teacher* on this very point—showing how the development of the then new Sunday school tended to encourage parents to shove their duties off on the church. That was 1879, mind you, and we are hearing the same thing still, as though it were a brand-new problem or condition. We shall not get anywhere by lamenting. But how alleviate the situation? Shall we do it by tying the home in with the church schools more closely? That seems to be a modern emphasis. Several denominations have completely relocated the focus of their curricula (notably the Presbyterian). They insist that no child be enrolled unless his parents are also enrolled—a requirement that has to

be relaxed into a matter of encouragement rather than rule. They have provided parents with the same material that goes to the teacher, with some additional help for the parent in home application.

All of this rests on one major premise, which could be the strength or the weakness of this whole attempt to meet the problem. The premise is that the sum and substance of the pattern for Christian growth is inherent in the subject matter of church school curricula, and that the parent's role should be that of home applier. Or, to put it a shade differently, it says that the church school knows the materials and tools of teaching best, while the parent knows the child best. Give the parent what the church school can offer, and let him or her adapt that to the child, and you have a winning combination. Perhaps I am a bit pessimistic, but I do not hope for any surprising results from these attempts to tie church school and home into a strong teaching partnership—at least with the devices we have used so far.

Even the public schools are finding the same problem impenetrable —for with all of the P.T.A.'s and the programs for having parents look over and sign homework, the essential purpose has not been achieved. The P.T.A. tends to become partly an adult education movement, partly a pressure group used by schools to attain certain objectives, partly a tool for helping teachers in their work—but scarcely a group that achieves any sense of home-school partnership in teaching arithmetic or spelling or reading. And parents who look over homework assignments have a disturbing suspicion that the chief motive is to educate the parent through subtle, if not underhanded, means.

At least this much might be said of such direct methods of church school-home partnership—that one partner has the feeling of being a junior partner, and so long as that is the case, the ends cannot be attained. We can say over and over and over that the home is the basic agency for Christian training, but let someone ask, How? and we begin to fumble for answers.

There are a few other attempts to restore the home's place. One is the persistent request for worship material for family use. Surprising as it seems, we have given very little attention to this, though not one of us would deny both its value and its appeal. We produce devotional material for private use, and we produce books of prayers and worship material for children, but we have not done much for general family

use where young children are involved. Even devotional booklets, while claiming to be adapted to families with children from eight-years-old and up, will use Scripture passages which are utterly meaningless to children—if not to many an adult—and prayers far beyond the ken of children.

Of course, there is some hesitancy in our church for educators to say that such materials are the province of the educational field; and yet the educational field has a mighty stake in it. If someone would screen the whole Bible from cover to cover and catalog passages by an age group level of comprehension, it would be a step in the right direction. (And by comprehension, I do not mean at all that every word must be definable by a child—I mean rather that the essential meaning of the passage is somewhere within his range of understanding and appreciation.) That would seem to be the first step in any such family devotional material.

Along with this request for worship materials for families with young children have come inquiries about courses of study that the home could use in its own Christian training. Should such courses even be contemplated? Should some attention be given to any type of formal training within the home? If you cite Luther's Small Catechism as precedent for it, it might be counter-argued that times have changed and that the home was *the* teaching agency of that time, along with the pastor, but that the movement of lay church school teachers had not yet arisen. Are we to hope for a return to the type of home teaching commanded in Deuteronomy—the type that runs through the entire Scriptures, which Paul himself expected? And is the church to be expected to provide guidance and materials for such controlled study? I keep this in question form because that is precisely the situation today —where no one seems to know the answer.

Role of Indirection in the Home

But all three types of program for restoring the home's primary role in Christian training—church school-home cooperation, appeal for family devotional material, and courses of study for the home—have a bearing on the home's real place in Christian training. It is more a role of indirection and exposure than of controlled, formalized instruction. No one knows better than the parent—at least on paper—when the

law of readiness is in operation for a child. And that law is basic in a child's appropriation of religious content. It operates to help in controlling associations and establishing patterns of conduct.

We might cite the matter of death and resurrection, for example. Educators are somewhat at a loss over where, in the child's age development, to peg the story of Jesus' crucifixion and resurrection. (That may seem a bit strange to adults, especially of the Lutheran persuasion; but when you stop and ask yourself, At what age should it be introduced? I think you can appreciate the educators' problem.) The problem is not lessened one bit by variations within an age group. In a class of five-year-olds, two of ten children may have had some experience of death in the family relationship. But you can not count on that.

So the general solution has been to peg it a bit later than we might hope for—we of Lutheran and somewhat traditionally indoctrinational bent—and hope the parents will watch for the law of readiness to make it come alive. It is at the time of family bereavement, or grief over a pet's death, that the lesson itself should be taught—because it is then relevant. But how are you going to control that? How can you even prepare for it, if your preparation is irrelevant and meaningless? How build associations if, at the time itself, stronger associations of the moment overpower those that have been weakly built—weakly because they have not been relevant? Any course of study to prepare for that would have to be so fluid as to be worthless as a course.

The truth of the matter is that the primary method of the home is far more that of indirection and secondary learning. And while the forces of Christian education can give guidance on matters of Christian atmosphere, habits of Christian devotion, and schooling in the faith and life of the parents, the substance and manner and method must perforce be left in a fluid state—so far as attempts to chart and test and measure are concerned. It is to that that attention must be given.

I have been deeply interested in the educational movement launched in the Episcopal Church recently. The educational leaders there came to the conclusion that you cannot do much with Christian training where Sunday schools would at most give a child slightly more than one full day's training a year—as opposed to the influences on him every other hour of the year; where teachers are spotty in their training and consecration; where the impact of secular forces is so overwhelming; where

homes do not feel a responsibility; where the schools of the church offer poor ground for practical application—they can cite all of the weaknesses of the Christian education program as we know it, and more besides. But the upshot was that they decided to tackle the problem at its roots—in the very environment in which every child grows up. So they have launched a vast evangelistic program—not for the sake of bringing others into the church, but to bring members of their congregations into a deep commitment to Christ. Educational work will succeed only with the redeemed fellowship, where the devotion to Christ and commitment of life to Christ are meaningful. Along with that, the adults themselves should know where they stand. If they cannot give reason for their faith to those who ask, how can they expect their children to know where they stand? So they have started to produce study books for adults—it is interesting that a curriculum should begin at the adult level rather than the normal course of starting with primary and junior children.

The whole movement has every mark of making a major of indirection as the basic teaching method. Exposing the child to the redeemed fellowship; gearing parents for the making of a home that bears the mark of Christian commitment, so that exposure to such an atmosphere will take deep root in the life of the child.

Parenthetically it might be said that we need a restudy of the relation of evangelism and education in our own church. If nothing else demands this, certainly the new theology does with its emphasis on the continuing impact of Christ—confrontation, to use the magic word—on the believer. We have tended to limit evangelism to justification and give the field of sanctification to education—and some such boundary area must be observed for purposes of administration, but it tends to become more and more artificial. Evangelism and education should work hand in hand, the one leading to commitment to Christ through the church, the other devoting itself to deepening that commitment; the one to effecting the redeemed fellowship, the other to the deepening and enriching and conserving of that fellowship. When such phrases are used as educational evangelism or evangelistic education, I am not at all sure that they relieve the problem one bit. You can stretch evangelism to include most, if not all, phases of education; and you can stretch education enough to include most, if not all, of evangelism. It

all depends on the approach you take and the breadth of your terms. There can scarcely be evangelism without educational content; and there certainly can be no education worthy of the adjective Christian that is not shot through with an evangelical, evangelistic character.

Up to this point I have tried to point out how vital, yet how difficult to control educationally, is this matter of indirection. We can see it in both home and church—where guidance for the one is a difficult problem for educators, and where the imponderables enter so deeply into the fabric of teaching—the power of the redeemed fellowship on the growth of the believer.

There are other areas which certainly deserve equal attention here: materials and methods in teaching, the relation of worship and Christian education. Such areas show the place that indirection has and must have in Christian education. This in no way means that everything that takes place by indirection should come under the surveillance of the board of the church charged with Christian education. Nor does it mean that we should label every association gained in that way as "educational." I am afraid that would kill it—because the very term "education" is not in the best of fragrance today. Whenever people want to swing others their way, they call it "educating them"—whether it be a certain type of beer, relief for China, proper procedures for adopting children, or getting new members for a lagging Brotherhood.

Furthermore, one imponderable—in fact, the sine qua non of all Christian education—is the work of the Holy Spirit. His methods and tools and techniques cannot be pinned down. It is not only Christian faith which defines his work in terms of enlightening and guiding and sanctifying. The definition of his work which is dearest to us is a definition that comes from a workbook in Christian education—Luther's Small Catechism. And while we may speak of the method of learning in terms of indirection or exposure or secondary learning, we could with even greater justification speak of the source of that learning as the work of the Spirit, wherever it effects the ends of commitment of life to Christ. This does not imply that he is in any way absent from those methods and materials which can achieve scientifically measured results; it simply means that he gives indirection the place and power it has.

But if our ultimate purpose be that of an ever-deepening commit-

ment of life to Christ through the body of believers, then every association direct or indirect becomes a matter of deep concern. For practical reasons, we may have to concentrate much of our effort on those attitudes and habits which we can guide or control—but in the very doing of that we should never lose sight of the vast place and power of attitudes and habits which can develop solely through uncharted ways—through exposure and indirection.

Notes and Studies

KERYGMA AND MYTHOS: THE THEOLOGY OF RUDOLF BULTMANN

By Paul Leo

THE German theological scene is a perennial hotbed of passionate discussion. At the present time the most heated argument centers around the work of Rudolf Bultmann. We shall try to present the background and intention of Bultmann's theological thought, followed by an attempt at an evaluation which at this time, however, cannot claim to come to definite results, since the discussion is still quite fluid and since there is no one who at this point could claim to be able to pass final judgment over Bultmann as an exegete and theologian.

Background

Most of those who know about him superficially are inclined to class him as an extreme exponent of liberalism. There is truth in this classification, but by no means the whole truth.

From the biographical standpoint, the starting point of Bultmann was historical criticism in its most radical form. To those who studied under the young teacher in Marburg some thirty years ago, as this writer did, he gave the impression of being a faithful heir of the ideals of the Marburg school, represented at that time by Jülicher, the great literary critic, and Heitmüller, one of the leading thinkers of the history of religion school, who were teaching side by side with Rudolf Otto, who harvested the fruits of the study of the history of religion in the field of systematic theology, and Karl Budde, one of the leaders in Old Testament criticism.

Bultmann's first important book, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition,* on the one hand, pushed historical criticism to the limits of radicalism. He emphasized very strongly the formative influence of the church upon the tradition of the sayings of Jesus, as well as upon the stories of his actions. Though Bultmann felt that the general outlines of Jesus' teaching are discernible, nevertheless the exact form of his sayings and the historical trustworthiness of the reports concerning his actions are highly questionable.

But, on the other hand, this book introduced an approach to New Testament criticism which was a step beyond the literary criticism of the preceding generation. Together with Martin Dibelius, Bultmann in this book introduced form criticism to the study of the New Testament, namely, that the tradition of stories

about and sayings of Jesus operates according to certain intrinsic laws, so that it is possible to separate later additions from a report and thus reconstruct its original form. For our purpose it is important to note the use of this new method in the work of Bultmann, because here we find the origin of his strong emphasis on the *kerygma,* the proclamation in the primitive church. Bultmann viewed the synoptic tradition in close connection with the life of the congregation, and that means, primarily, in its proclamation. The Synoptic Gospels to him were not so much historical sources for the life of Jesus as documents displaying the preaching and teaching of the earliest church. He who reads the gospels finds himself in the midst of the teaching and worship of the first Christian generations, he participates in their endeavor to bring Christ to a generation which, though near in time to the origin, had not seen the Master with its own eyes.

Thus it is clear that, in spite of all its radical historical criticism, his book was by no means *merely* negative and destructive. It opened a new way of understanding and evaluating the gospels as living entities, growing and developing together with the life of the church.

The ensuing development showed that this interest of Bultmann in the *kerygma* of the first centuries was by no means merely historical and scientific. The concept of the *kerygma,* which had a central position in his view of the New Testament, became also his key to the understanding of the New Testament for every succeeding generation, including our own.

At this point we must glance at the general theological development in Germany at that time. In 1919 Karl Barth's commentary on Romans was published, which initiated a new theological era. Barth's main objective was this: he strove to dissociate himself from the presuppositions which had directed the Bible study of liberalism, in particular the assumption that there are certain given laws of thinking which have an axiomatic authority in modern thought and which must also direct our understanding and our evaluation of the biblical message. As a result of this presupposition, he argued, liberal scholars knew beforehand what the Bible could say and what it could *not* say, what we can believe and what we must refuse to believe. Thus large portions—in fact, the central tenets of the New Testament message—lost their significance, as, for instance, the incarnation, miracles, resurrection and ascension, the return for judgment. Jesus became predominantly a religious teacher, his message became a teaching about God and his will, his justice and his grace, all of which looked much like a general religious insight which man can acquire through his own thinking and religious experience, and which is more *endorsed* and *affirmed* through the teaching of the Bible than *revealed.* Idealistic thinking—as over against an acceptance of the divine word—was the keynote of liberal theology.

Over against such liberalism which, however, in their judgment extended deep into the ranks of so-called conservatives, Barth and his friends established with great power the central importance of divine revelation through the Word of God as it is given to us in the Bible. This Word does not convey a general truth, but

addresses the individual personality in his individual situation. We must hear it here and now—that is what was called the dialectic character of the Word of God. And we must not approach the Bible with a preconceived idea of its content—we must see it *over against* ourselves with a message which enters our life as something new, something which is not in our power, but which exerts its power over us. We must be ready to hear in the Word of God things which go contrary to everything which we might have expected. Thus the central tenets of the Gospel were seen in a new light and with a new power. Christ the crucified and risen Lord became once again the center of theology.

It was necessary to discuss this position at some length, because Bultmann, for a time at least, fought in the ranks of the so-called dialectic theology and made this new approach to the Bible (which, however, was regarded as the old approach of the Reformers) his own. This shows that Bultmann is by no means fully characterized by applying the label of radical historical critic. If we look at the *whole* of his work, the name liberalism should not be used for his position at all, because though he accepts the methods of historical criticism in their most highly developed form yet he rejects the *ideology* of liberalism. Jesus for him is *not* primarily the teacher of religion and ethics, the Bible is *not* a collection of religious and ethical truths which are in conformity with the highest thoughts whch the human mind can acquire by itself. No, the Bible is a word of divine revelation which meets us in our earthly situation, convinces us of our human bondage, and shows us the way to salvation and freedom through the cross and resurrection of Christ.

We begin to feel that it is difficult to classify Bultmann, and we begin to understand why the discussion about him is so passionate and why agreed results are so difficult to reach.

Here we have a man who, with the methods of historical criticism, tries to establish a preaching of the gospel which at least *intends* to maintain the basic tenets of biblical theology. We shall try to see whether they are really preserved in Bultmann's formulations.

In his own statements Bultmann dissociates himself from the old liberal tradition. He claims that his criticism is essentially different from liberal criticism. Whereas liberals of the old school intended to eliminate from the biblical message everything which runs counter to modern thinking, Bultmann intends to reinterpret these elements.

Bultmann's Program

His views along this line were first published, in a powerful and condensed form, in 1942 under the title *Neues Testament und Mythologie,* with the subtitle *Das Problem der Entmythologisierung der neutestamentlichen Verkündigung* (The Problem of Demythologizing the New Testament Message). For those who had been following the rich and manifold production of Bultmann, this publication did not contain a real surprise. But it presented his views in an impressive and

forceful condensation which was heard like a resounding trumpet blast by the theological public. A man may express revolutionary thoughts for a long time in a more indirect and discursive way—they will be noticed, but will not create excitement. But if he presents them in an uncompromising and compact program, the world will suddenly be awakened to the real consequences and the battle cries will be raised from both camps, cries of angry rejection, and cries of enthusiastic acclaim. Bultmann's program for the understanding of the New Testament message certainly called forth both.

Bultmann begins with the assertion that the world view underlying the New Testament message is mythological and can therefore no longer be accepted by us. The world is divided into three stories: heaven, earth, and hell. Angels and demons are at work in the world, exercising their power over man. God and the devil work through miracles. Jesus is a pre-existent being, his suffering on the cross works salvation for man, his resurrection is the beginning of a cosmic catastrophe, he is seated at the right hand of God and will return for judgment —all statements, according to Bultmann, which are mythological and hence unacceptable to us, because our world view is not mythological but scientific.

This leads to an enumeration of a whole catalog of New Testament teachings which are necessarily eliminated by modern thought:

> Eliminated are . . . the stories of Christ's ascension and of his descent into hell, eliminated is the expectation of the coming of the "Son of Man" with the clouds of heaven and the rapture of the believers in the air, eliminated is, through the knowledge of the forces and laws of nature, the belief in spirits and demons. . . . The miracles of the New Testament are . . . eliminated as miracles. . . . One cannot use electric light and radio, apply modern medical and clinical methods in case of sickness, and at the same time believe in the New Testament world of demons and miracles. . . . The mythical eschatology is in fact eliminated in consequence of the simple fact that the return of Christ did not—as the New Testament writers expected—happen at once. . . . And he who thinks that he can (accept this mythology) for himself must realize that if he declares this to be the attitude of the Christian faith he makes the Christian message unintelligible and impossible for the present time. . . . But we are not only concerned about the criticism which results from the scientific view of the world, but even more about the criticism which results from the way modern man understands himself. . . . He understands himself as a unified being. . . . He does not understand himself in that strangely divided fashion as the New Testament sees man, so that foreign powers can exert influence upon his inner life. . . . Therefore, what the New Testament says about spirit (*pneuma*) and sacraments is for him altogether alien and unintelligible.[1]

The same thing applies to the doctrine that death is a punishment for our sins, the doctrine of the vicarious atonement through the death of Christ, the resurrection of Christ as an event that creates a power of life in which man can participate through the sacraments, the idea of Christ's heavenly pre-existence and

1 Hans Werner Bartsch, *Kerygma und Mythos* (Hamburg, 1948), p. 18 f., which contains a reprint of *Neues Testament und Mythologie* from which this and subsequent quotations are taken.

the corresponding idea of our own transplantation into a heavenly world of light. All this—according to Bultmann—is mythological and has no meaning for modern man.

Bultmann's next step in unraveling the knot serves only to sharpen the problem. He rejects the possibility of a selective process which eliminates certain mythical elements and preserves others. One can not, for instance, eliminate the dogma of the virgin birth as less important but retain the resurrection on account of its central position in the Christian message. "The mythical view of the universe can only be either accepted or rejected as a whole."[2] Bultmann declares that this decision is an *ethical* duty: "Here the theologian and preacher owes absolute clarity and (intellectual) purity to himself, to the congregation, and to all whom he wants to win for the congregation."[3]

Only one measure, therefore, remains: "If the message of the New Testament shall retain its validity, there is no other way than to demythologize it" (p. 22).

In order to understand what Bultmann means by demythologizing, we must first try to grasp what meaning the term *mythos* has for him. We must discard the vulgar conception which regards myth as being simply an untrue story, a fairy tale. In consonance with the use of the term in the study of the history of religion, Bultmann offers the following definition:

> Mythological is the view in which the unworldly, the divine, appears as worldly, as human; in which the transcendent appears as immanent; in which, e.g., the transcendence of God is conceived in terms of distance in space; in which the cult is understood as an action in which immaterial powers are conveyed by material means.[4]

Myth is, then, distinguished from an untrue story, a fairy tale, by its ideological content. Myth has meaning, is laden with spiritual significance. And it is Bultmann's thesis that we can eliminate the mythical element from the New Testament and yet preserve its spiritual significance.

> In myth the faith that this familiar world, which we have at our disposal and in which man lives, does not have its goal and foundation in itself, but that its foundation and goal lie outside the familiar and disposable, and that this world of the familiar and the disposable is continuously permeated and endangered by the sinister powers which are its foundation and limit, finds expression. At the same time myth gives expression to the insight that man is not his own master, . . . that he is dependent upon the powers which are active beyond the world which we know.[5]

Thus, according to Bultmann, the real intention of myth lies beyond the objects it speaks about, and we are only expressing the innermost purpose of

2 P. 22.
3 P. 22.
4 P. 23.
5 P. 23.

myth if we try to express the truth which myth wants to convey in the language of our time. This new expression will make it clear that the New Testament, in mythological terms, means to express *a certain understanding of human existence*. If this is the purpose of the New Testament, the task of exegesis is, then, to crack the shell of myth to discover the New Testament view of human existence. The New Testament means to answer the questions: Who is man? What is his real nature? How is he in bondage? How can he become free? The New Testament answers these questions in terms of the mythical mode of thought which was common to the whole ancient world. Exegesis is the process of interpreting the mythological language of this message in terms of modern thought. Bultmann finds an especial right for this undertaking in the fact that, according to his exegetical understanding, the New Testament writers themselves try to dissolve the mythical background here and there, *e.g.*, in the realm of eschatology.

Here we observe Bultmann's close tie with Martin Heidegger's philosophy of existentialism. To arrive at an understanding of my own existence, which is the leading thought in Heidegger's philosophy, becomes the center of Bultmann's interpretation of the New Testament. It has even been asserted by his critics that there is more Heidegger than Bible in Bultmann's makeup.

But what is the understanding of himself which man receives through the biblical message? 1) Man sees himself in a world of mortality and death and finds himself, contrary to his own will and decision, surrendered to the power of mortality, the realm of the visible and tangible. This visible, mortal world which seduces man to surrender to it, is called flesh (*sarx*). 2) Man surrender to this world in two ways: either by a life of lust, or by a life of morality which makes him proud of his own works. We live in the flesh whenever we build our life upon visible things from which we expect satisfaction and security. This is the life of selfwill (*Eigenmächtigkeit*).

In contrast to this misguided life of the flesh, the *true* life of man is lived out of the powers of the invisible which we do not have at our disposal. A life which discards all selfmade security, all self-reliance and selfwill, is a life according to the spirit—the life in faith. Such a life is ours through faith in the forgiving grace of God. This grace frees us from the bondage of our past. Life in faith is open to the future—it is "eschatological" life.

Up to this point, according to Bultmann, human existence can be seen and understood by a deeply probing philosophy. He feels that Martin Heidegger and other existentialists have penetrated to this point. And with the bold honesty which is characteristic of his scholarship, he poses the question whether this insight is not sufficient, whether Christ is really indispensable for the Christian faith, whether, perhaps, the basic insights of the New Testament—though historically they have their origin in Jesus—can now be dissociated from him and proclaimed as a philosophy of life in their own right. (This, as we saw, was the ultimate consequence of the older liberalism, where the teaching of Jesus was understood as the highest religious insight which, however, human reason can reach by itself

unaided by special revelation.) According to the existentialists the destiny of man is in the grasp of human decision. Man can realize his state of bondage, and can decide to turn away from it and choose inner freedom.

For Bultmann such a positive step is inconceivable. Man is self-willed through and through. He can *know* that he has no real life, but he cannot *seize upon* his real life. He is completely in the bondage of his self-will. That is why the New Testament calls man a sinner.

Man cannot be freed by his own decision but only by an act of God. God's love meets man

> as the power which embraces and bears him, which accepts him, even in his self-reliance and bondage (*Verfallenheit*), *i.e.*, which acknowledges him as what he is not—and that means, frees him from his own being.[6]

This is the meaning of the Christ-event:

> It says that where man cannot act God acts for him, that he *has* acted for him. . . . What happens in Christ is the revelation of the love of God which frees man from himself toward his true existence, liberating him for a life of surrender in faith and love. . . . Faith in the love of God is selfwill as long as the love of God is just an object of wishful thinking, an idea, as long as God has not *revealed* his love. . . . This is the crucial point which distinguishes the New Testament from philosophy and which distinguishes the Christian faith from a "natural" understanding of our existence. The New Testament speaks of . . . an action of God which alone makes possible . . . the true life of man.[7]

But in how far is this Christ-event mythological? How can its true meaning be brought to light by the process of demythologizing? Bultmann compares New Testament history with pagan mythology and comes to the conclusion that there is one decisive difference: in pagan mythology we have to do with imaginary personalities, whereas the New Testament speaks of an historical person, Jesus of Nazareth. For Bultmann large portions of the story of Jesus are mythological. He raises the question whether these elements intend to express the significance of the personality of Jesus and his history. This is in fact his opinion, and so he regards it possible to demythologize the story of Jesus and to formulate its significance in non-mythological terms.

He regards the virgin birth and the pre-existence of Christ as being easily demythologized. Both these concepts—which he regards as having a different origin but expressing the same thought—express his supra-historical significance. They mean to say that his historical origin is not important because his significance has an eternal character.

The main problem for Bultmann is the non-mythological meaning of cross and resurrection.

6 P. 41.
7 P. 43 f.

The cross of Christ is in itself an historical fact, but its religious message is expressed in mythological language. The sacrificial death of Christ, its atoning character, the vicarious nature of his suffering—all these concepts belong to a past which thought in mythological terms. The true and non-mythological meaning of the cross is that in the cross judgment has been passed *over us,* over man who has surrendered to the powers of the world. The important thing is not the cross as an event of the past, but its meaning to *me* and to *my* existence. Thus, to believe in the cross does not mean to look back on an historical event, but to take Christ's cross upon *myself* as *my* cross, to be crucified with Christ. The cross is an eschatological event in so far as it is continually present to the faith and always confronts the believer with the realm beyond time, with eternity. It is present in the sacraments and in the concrete decision in the life of the believer (*dem konkreten Lebensvollzug des Glaubenden*). Paul sees the cross in this light when he speaks of the faithful as "always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus." As a saving event, the cross is not a mythological happening, but an event with significance for the present which *originates* in the historical fact of the crucifixion of Jesus of Nazareth.

The message of the resurrection is nothing but an expression of the significance of the cross. Cross and resurrection belong together. The resurrection means nothing more than this, that "the death of Jesus on the cross shall be viewed, not as a human death, but as the liberating judgment of God over the world, the judgment which as such robs death of its power."[8] Thus the resurrection is not a miracle which, following upon the crucifixion, testifies that Jesus is the Son of God. Though several passages in the New Testament seem to see it that way, Bultmann thinks that this view is not on the highest level of New Testament teaching. The resurrection is "the eschatological fact through which Christ has destroyed death and brought to light life and immortality."[9] Participation in the resurrection like that in the cross takes place in the decision of the individual life, in a "militant freedom from sin. . . . Faith in the resurrection equals faith in the cross as a saving event."[10]

But how can we *see* that the cross is a saving event? Why can we make such a statement? "Here only one answer seems possible: *Because it is preached as such, because it is proclaimed together with the resurrection.*"

At this point, Bultmann's argument comes to its ultimate consequence: the historical fact which we can see, and which we can prove in history is *not* the resurrection of Christ, for that is an eschatological event which is not accessible to historical research and which the New Testament relates in mythological terms. *The accessible historical fact is the faith of the first disciples in the resurrection.* Thus we cannot escape the conclusion that, for Bultmann, the saving event is not the resurrection of Christ but the *faith in* the resurrection, the *kerygma* of the

8 P. 48.
9 P. 49.
10 P. 49.

resurrection. The preached word itself belongs to the eschatological event of salvation. Hence the church, in which the word is proclaimed, has an eschatological significance. The apostles, the preachers, the church—all are understandable in the context of the history of culture, and yet all are eschatological phenomena. "The paradox of the presence of the transcendent God in history is claimed: the Word became flesh."[11] On this note Bultmann closes his programmatic manifesto.

Evaluation

Let us first try to gain a clear impression of Bultmann's *intention.*

There is no doubt, first of all, that Bultmann is and wants to be an historical exegete of the New Testament. While it is not within the scope of this article to appraise his contributions along this line, it should be stated that by his far-reaching historical and philological research he has thrown light upon wide aspects of the historical background and the theological significance of the New Testament. He has opened new avenues to the study of the Synoptics and John, as well as upon the theology of Paul. He has taught us to view the New Testament writers *historically,* and not with the prejudices of modern concepts of thinking. It is true that his work is marred for us by what has been called his "brazen scepticism," his inclination to over-emphasize difficulties and to deal with New Testament texts in a highhanded way. Nonetheless, as historian and exegete Bultmann has his place as one of the leading New Testament scholars of our generation.

But Bultmann is more than historian and philologian. He approaches the New Testament with a strong sense of responsibility toward the Christian congregation. Strangely enough, this man who is regarded by many as the outstanding revolutionary and iconoclast in the church wants to be an "apologete." One of his friends told me that when he reproached Bultmann for destroying the church, Bultmann replied: But my whole desire is to *build* the church! In addition to his scientific purpose, Bultmann's foremost intention is to interpret the gospel in such a way that it is digestible for the modern mind. In his relentless criticism he is eager, not to destroy the gospel, but to preserve its essence. But he feels that this cannot be done except by exercising the utmost honesty. We recall the gist of two statements quoted above: First, the warning that mythological elements make the gospel incomprehensible to the modern mind, and, secondly, that the pastor owes himself and his congregation absolute honesty. Bultmann is a fanatic of honesty, though he makes us feel that he would be willing to destroy large portions of the gospel rather than make a single statement which is not an exact expression of our belief.

That is the way *we* see him, but we should realize that it is *not* the way Bultmann sees himself. For Bultmann the gospel reinterpreted from an existential viewpoint is just as powerful and rich as what he calls the old "mythological" gospel. To us it seems that, in a frenzy of honesty, he robs the gospel of all its

11 P. 53.

plumage until it stands deprived, naked and almost meaningless before our frightened eyes. Like the superperfect housewife who distressed her family with her fanatical cleanliness, and who admitted ruefully that as a girl she had scrubbed her pet canary to death. Honesty is a wonderful thing, and we should listen to Bultmann when he admonishes us to honesty—but we still feel that by his fanaticism for intellectual cleanliness he scrubs the gospel to death.

Though not fully to death. Some aspects of his exegesis are wonderful, and a full expression of New Testament teaching. This is true of his urgent demand that man see his whole existence under the claim and comfort of the gospel. It is true of his view of man before he comes to faith and of his stress upon the necessity for revelation. This man who is so eager to keep in touch with modern ways of thinking nevertheless takes upon himself the *skandalon* of asserting that man cannot turn his life around by his own decision, that only God can bring him around by an act of revelation. No statement could be more foolish to the "Greeks" of our time![12]

To summarize, Bultmann has made valuable contributions by his penetrating historical and theological research, by his practical approach to the New Testament, his passionate plea for honesty in our thinking, and his deep concern that the truth of the gospel should be stated in terms comprehensible to modern man. Though we could not accept the type of preaching which he suggests, he issues a challenge which should not be too lightly dismissed. In our preaching and teaching ministry, we are too prone to repeat the traditional formulations of the Christian message without trying to present the gospel in such a way that it is really communicated.

The question whether Bultmann's teaching is heretical has been frequently raised. Essential elements in his thought cannot be accepted by the church, though, of course, such a judgment can never be passed by an individual but must come as a reaction of the whole church. But even where we reject Bultmann's views as contrary to the teaching of the church we should realize that so-called heresy has its providential place in the life of the church, by posing questions which need to be answered. The church has the duty of rejecting the wrong answers given to such questions, but the further and more important duty of listening to the questions and seeking the right answers. The letter to the Galatians would never have been written had it not been for the Judaizers; the Colossian letter answers questions to which Gnosticism had given wrong answers.

We may take a further step in accepting Bultmann's views. Our world view is obviously different from the world view of a three-fold local universe and of

12 As far as his principles are concerned, we furthermore fully agree with him if he holds that an event like the resurrection is unapproachable by the methods of historical research. We cannot prove scientifically that Christ rose from the dead, and only misguided apologetic thinking tries to do that. This message addresses, not our reason, but our faith. The risen Lord was seen only by those who believed in him. That does not mean, however, that the event is mythical.

a sun circling the earth. Whether our world view will soon be modified or changed we do not know. But we are agreed that the essence of the gospel has not been changed by this change in scientific outlook. There is, furthermore, no doubt that Bultmann is right in his view that the Bible contains what he calls mythological elements—though we should prefer to call them symbolical. The best example of such elements is found in the eschatological teaching of the Bible. Revelation is properly understood only if we take its images, figures, and dramatic events to be a symbolical presentation of things which go beyond human expression. But we should realize that this symbolical language is more than a presentation of existential truth in a mythological veil. It symbolizes more than mere aspects of human existence. Symbolical language expresses *realities,* realities of such a nature that they cannot be fully expressed in human terms. Consider, for example, the blast of the last trumpet which certainly is more than the sound of any trumpet which we have blown or heard. Something vastly greater and more awesome is pictured—but something which has a reality outside of our existence. Where the Bible uses symbolical language it expresses objective realities which go beyond the limits of human thought and imagination.

This brings us to the main point of disagreement with Bultmann. All the writers of the New Testament want to convey an objective truth. Even if we should grant, as Bultmann maintains, that there is, for example, a development from the eschatological view of the Synoptics to that of John, it is certainly a *real* consummation of the kingdom of God which is expressed. As far as the life of Christ is concerned, it simply takes the heart out of the New Testament message if we regard not the resurrection, but the faith of the disciples in the resurrection as the basic fact which constitutes the church. We fully agree with Barth that the truth that the Word became flesh in Jesus Christ, and not the *kerygma* of this truth must be accepted as the center of the biblical message. We cannot give up the conviction that a real *Heilsgeschichte* is the heart of the Bible. Here we regard Cullmann's *Christ and Time* as a very convincing counterpart to Bultmann's view.

But what about the capacity of modern man for receiving this message? Here Karl Barth[13] has a good word to say. He points out that in "that strange spring time" 30 years ago the intention of the new dialectic school was "a new and better listening to, and reproducing of, the New Testament message itself." Over against this he feels that Bultmann today overemphasizes the "translation" of the message into modern terms.

At this point Bultmann seems to us to continue to be a liberal, to approach the Bible with preconceived ideas about what he has a right to teach, and what not, with prejudices derived from modern concepts of thinking. We should rather listen to what the Bible really says. It is especially difficult to understand how an exegete of Bultmann's stature can close his eyes to the fact that he is inter-

13 *Rudolf Bultmann, ein Versuch ihn zu verstehen* (Zurich, 1952). The limitation expressed in the title of Barth's essay is cheerfully accepted by the present writer also.

preting into the Bible if he denies that the objective facts of the history of salvation are the backbone of the Bible and points instead to a supposed new interpretation of human existence.

And Barth is also right when he maintains, as over against Bultmann's definition of the mythological, that the center of the New Testament message is just this, that the divine and unworldly *did* appear in this world—in Jesus Christ.

Bultmann would object to the criticism that he eliminates the objective act of God. He would maintain that he stresses strongly the Christ-event. But he vitiates his stress upon the Christ-event by his insistence that it exists not in the objective fact itself, but rather in the faith of the disciples and in the *kerygma* of the church. If someone asked the question, Why is Rome the most beautiful city in the world? and the answer was given, Because people say it is, we would be dissatisfied with the logic. A sounder conclusion would go the other way around: People say that Rome is the most beautiful city in the world, because it *really is* the most beautiful city.

Bultmann seems to invert the relation of the saving work of God and man's belief in it, so that the latter receives a sort of independent significance. The truth, we believe, is that God's act is basic—and faith only lives in relation to the divine act.

Our disagreement with Bultmann is rooted in a radical difference of approach: We think it is wrong to let preconceived principles take us captive in our approach to the New Testament. We must rather listen to the New Testament with the expectation of the unexpected. We must be ready to hear things which go beyond our intellectual capacities, because—whatever Bultmann might say—this also belongs to the *skandalon* of the Bible that it does not fit into our intellectual presuppositions. There are questions which we simply cannot answer, mysteries which must remain unsolved. Is that dishonesty or cowardice? We think it is rather humility and an honest response to the fact that God's thoughts surpass our thoughts.

LUTHER AND CHURCH GOVERNMENT

By G. M. Bruce

THE position of Luther with respect to church government has been and continues to be a mooted one. This fact is again illustrated in Dr. Uuras Saarnivaara's article on "The Church of Christ According to Luther" in the May, 1953, number of The Lutheran Quarterly, in which he says (p. 153): "The dominating position of princes in the Lutheran Churches of various lands, which became almost universal after Luther, cannot be traced back to the teachings and principles of the Reformer," and quotes the Swedish writer Gustaf

Törnvall in his *Andligt och varldsligt regimente hos Luther*[1] as his authority for the statement. While admitting the truth of the statement that follows the above quotation, as far as it goes, that "he believed that the church should be subject to Christ and his Word alone," my own studies of Luther and in the field of church polity do not support the over-simplified assertion of the statement quoted. These studies cover a period of over four decades, and have been recently intensified by researches in this field in connection with the preparation of *A Manual of Church Polity,* which I hope to have ready for publication some time next year.

Let me call attention to the fact that it is not historically correct to say that "the dominating position of princes in the Lutheran Churches of various lands became almost universal *after* Luther." This had become "almost universal" long before Luther's death, and the "dominating position of princes" was in process of development during all the years of the spreading and constructive work of the Lutheran Reformation, and that with the active cooperation of Luther and his co-workers, especially his own pastor, John Bugenhagen, who was the author of some of the basic church orders of the sixteenth century, composed in his own Low German speech, and counselor to princes and kings in the establishment of *Landeskirchen.* Bugenhagen worked in close collaboration in this field with Luther and had Luther's approval of the orders which he drew up. This development gained considerable momentum from the time of the Peasant Revolt in 1525 and the Diet of Spires in 1528, which gave the Lutheran movement a legal standing in such states or provinces in which the secular rulers were favorably disposed toward Lutheran doctrine and practice.

As early as July, 1525, Duke Albrecht of Prussia issued in his own name a comprehensive church order for the state of Prussia, providing for the ecclesiastical and secular government, and he speaks throughout in the first person, "we desire" and "we command" thus and so.[2] The Saxon Visitation Articles, 1527-28, likewise recognize the ruler as the chief governing head of the church. In his directive (*Instruktion*), Duke John authorizes and empowers Melanchthon and others to conduct a visitation of the churches of his domain, investing them with power to make inquiries into the conditions that prevail, deal with both ecclesiastical and civil authorities, make such adjustments as they may see fit, and even mete out punishments to such as would hinder or resist them in any way whatsoever, outlining specifically the areas for their inquiry and action. The directive is signed by Duke John and his official seal is affixed. Then follows

1 Also available in a German translation, *Geistliches und weltliches Regiment bei Luther* (Munich, 1948).

2 For the text of this order see A. L. Richter, ed., *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des sechszehnten Jahrhunderts* (Weimar, 1846), I, 28, 29. The order was revised twice during Luther's life, 1540 and 1544, as well as later in the century. Texts of all these orders are printed in Richter. [A better edition is by E. Sehling, *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des 16, Jahrhunderts,* 5 vols. (Leipzig, 1902-13).]

Melanchthton's *Unterricht der Visitatoren an die Pharhern ym Kurfurstenthumb zu Sachsen.*

The Visitation Articles of 1527-28 were further revised and enlarged in 1528-29 and were issued as a mandate by the ruler to the civil authorities of the province as well as to the pastors and subjects. The civil authorities were especially enjoined to see to it that the Word of God is preached in its truth and purity and that the sacraments are properly administered; that the affairs of the congregations are properly managed; that the sick and the poor are adequately provided for; that the subjects hear the preaching of the Word with due attention and respect; that the pastors are properly housed and supported, and that they punish not only thieves, murderers, and other gross offenders, but also their subjects who disregard or disrespect the Word and sacraments, conduct themselves in an un-Christian manner, swearing, getting drunk, committing adultery, and neglecting the Christian training of their children. They are further directed to secure properly trained and faithful pastors for the churches within their respective jurisdictions.

All this secular government of the church took place under the very eyes of Luther and with his full knowledge. What was his attitude toward it? His preface to the Visitation Articles of 1527-28 gives a very conclusive answer. In this preface he calls attention to the deplorable condition that prevails, both within church and state, and especially in the former, with which he is most keenly concerned, and states that he and his associates would like to bring about order in the church by the establishment of the episcopal and supervisory office, but he feels the lack of authority to undertake such a step. Luther plainly acknowledged his inability to cope with the situation that had arisen within the churches after the breakdown of papal rule and humbly begged the elector to step in, appoint and invest with the necessary authority these visitors, and give directions for their work. This the elector promptly did, appointing two representatives of the state and two of the church. The elector's directive was sent to Luther for his review and approval, and under date of October 12, 1527, Luther wrote to Elector Johann, among other things, as follows: "Our pastor, John Bugenhagen and I have read over the Visitation Articles and changed but few things in them, as Your Grace will find indicated. For the whole thing pleases us greatly because it is put in the simplest possible way for the common people."[3] According to a letter from the elector to Luther under date of September 30, 1527, this was at least the second time that Luther and Bugenhagen had reviewed this order.

A church order for Hesse, known as the *Reformatio ecclesiarum Hassiae,* and radically distinct from the above-mentioned orders—in fact, all the evangelical constitutions of the sixteenth century—both in origin and content, was presented to a synod at Homberg in 1526. This synod was called by Philip of Hesse and consisted of representatives of the various churches of his domain. Some representatives of the state were also present, but appear more in the role of observers

3 P. Smith and C. M. Jacobs, eds., *Luther's Correspondence,* II, p. 415.

than participants. This synod, summoned by Philip under the provisions of the decree of the Diet of Spires, was thus purely an ecclesiastical assembly. Its purpose was to formulate a plan for the government of the church in accordance with the Lutheran conception of the priesthood of believers and the idea that the doctrine and government of the church are subject to the Word of God alone. This order, prepared in part at least by a former Franciscan by the name of Francis Lambert, provided that congregations should arise out of the preaching of the Gospel and consist only of true believers, with the right to call and dismiss pastors, determine doctrine and practice, exercise discipline, and provide for the training of the young. It re-established the government by bishops, elders, and deacons. The general government of the church was vested in an annual synod, consisting of representatives of the churches and their bishops (pastors), and an interim committee of thirteen members, in the election of which the prince and the nobility had a vote. The synod was to elect three supervisors (*Visitatoren*) to supervise and direct the work and management of the churches throughout the state. For the first year, or until the Gospel had become firmly established, the prince was to appoint these supervisors. This order was not formally adopted by the synod, as Philip desired to have it approved by Luther before it was printed and put into effect. He sent it to Luther with the request that he review it and give his opinion. According to those who make Luther's early statements on church, church government, and the relation between the ecclesiastical and secular domain determinative for the views and position of the more mature and realistic Luther, this order ought to have met with Luther's full approval. But Luther disapproved of it as being too radical! Under date of January 7, 1527, he replied to Philip of Hesse that he was reluctant to give his opinion as he did not want to give the impression of forcing any one to act according to his views in the matter. "But to oblige Your Grace, and since this order might raise an outcry if published without my consent," he wrote, "I humbly and faithfully advise you not to allow it to be printed at this time, for I have never had, and have not now, sufficient courage to pass so many radical laws at once."[4]

Due to Luther's disapproval of the Hessian order, it was not put into effect, but it has served as a valuable historical document in the recording of the early attempts to solve some of the vexing problems of church polity, so perplexing to the sixteenth century Reformers, both Lutheran and Reformed. It is also a notable landmark in the history of the development of synodical and presbyteral systems of church government.

Bugenhagen and Melanchthon exerted greater direct influence on the development of Lutheran church polity during the sixteenth century than Luther, but Luther's indirect influence in the form of criticisms, suggestions, and final approval of the work of his associates was strongly marked. Bugenhagen, espe-

4 *Ibid.*, p. 391. For text of the order see Richter, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 56 ff. There is an account of the synod in Richter, *Geschichte der evangelischen Kirchenverfassung*, pp. 35-42. [See also R. L. Winters, *Francis Lambert of Avignon* (Philadelphia, 1938), for a recent study in English.]

cially, is noted for his part in the development of both city- and state-wide forms of church government, both as consultant and author of church orders. Among the orders which he prepared in whole or in part may be mentioned those of Brunswick, 1528; Hamburg, 1529; Lübeck, 1531; Pomerania, 1535; Denmark-Norway, 1537; Schleswig-Holstein, 1542-43; and Hildesheim, 1544. These were all written in Low German. The Brunswick order, of which Bugenhagen was the sole author, became the general pattern of all of them. It was prepared for the city of Brunswick at the request of the city council and the congregations there. In his preface Bugenhagen stated that, above all, three things are necessary to carry on the work of the church: good schools, properly trained and faithful pastors, and adequate provisions for the poor and needy.[5] These basic objectives, with some variation in language, appear in other prefaces of Bugenhagen's church orders. It is the duty of the civil authorities, in conjunction with the congregations, to make ample provision for each one of these specific objectives. All matters pertaining to marriage and family affairs are to be handled by a court composed of both civil and ecclesiastical representatives.

When King Christian III of Denmark had entered Copenhagen as conqueror on August 6, 1536, he at once summoned the State Council (*Rigsraadet*) to make final arrangements for the transition of Denmark and Norway from the Catholic regime (in which the bishops played an important role in their two-fold capacity of civil and ecclesiastical rulers) to a rule under the principles of the Reformation (under which the bishops would be deprived of their position both as civil rulers and as holders of enormous church property). Naturally he met a powerful resistance on the part of the bishops. Not only were they unwilling to yield their civil power, but they were even more reluctant to give up their hold on the vast church properties. And no wonder. Bishop Joachim Ronnow, who also held the office of chancellor of the realm (*Rigskansler*), was the owner of thirty-three castles and about one-fourth of the tillable soil of Zealand (Sjaelland)![6] The king, realizing that negotiations with the bishops would not bring the desired results, decided on a more drastic action, and on the night of August 11, in a surprise move, arrested the three principal bishops, those of Zealand, Skaane, and Ribe, and subsequently took possession of their estates. In a letter to the king, dated December 2, 1536, Luther commended the king for his action and urged him to use the crown properties for the support of the ministry in his realm. He wrote: "I have received Your Majesty's letter, and am much pleased that you have extirpated the bishops (who are always persecuting God's Word and intriguing in worldly matters), and I shall reply to Your Majesty to reserve sufficient funds out of the church property belonging to the crown for the benefit of the churches and pastors. For if everything be dispersed, how are the preachers to be maintained? Perhaps this admonition is not necessary, for doubtless Your Majesty will act in a Christian manner; but there are so many among us who wish to grasp everything, and if

5 Richter, *Kirchenordnungen*, I, pp. 106-20.

6 L. P. Fabricius, *Danmarks Kirkehistorie*, II, p. 192.

God had not given us such pious princes, who conscientiously see to the welfare of their subjects, many churches and parishes would lie waste."[7]

Shortly afterwards (August 23) King Christian requested of the elector of Saxony the loan of Bugenhagen to come and help him establish the Reformation in Denmark. On July 5 Bugenhagen and his wife arrived in Copenhagen, together with the young theologian Peder Palladius, who later played a leading part in the Danish Reformation. In the meantime a church order had been drafted under the title, "Ordinatio ecclesiastica Regnorum Daniae et Norwegiae et Ducatuum Slesvicensis, Holsatiae, etc.," which had been sent to Luther for review and approval. With Luther's approval this order was brought along by Bugenhagen on his arrival. It was based on the orders of Brunswick, Hamburg, Lübeck, and others, and provided for evangelical teachers and preachers, Lutheran confession and ceremonies, schools, calling and support of pastors and superintendents, maintenance of church properties, provision for the poor and needy, with a recognition of certain congregational rights, under the direct supervision of secular authorities, with the king at the head. The pastor was nominated by the congregation or the city council, and the nomination was reported to the bishop, who examined the candidate, and then, if approved, sent him to the sheriff (*lensmand*), who extended the letter of call. Before taking over as pastor, the candidate had to take an oath of loyalty to the king and promise faithfulness in his ministry. The oath, together with the call, was then sent back to the bishop, who sent a *kollats*, a certificate of appointment, to the congregation, and then installed the candidate as pastor. The superintendent was chosen by the ministerium of a diocese (*stift*), and his election was confirmed by the king.[9]

On September 2, 1537, Bugenhagen consecrated seven evangelical bishops (the title superintendent used in the order soon disappeared) who had been appointed by the king. He crowned Christian king with a solemn ceremony in Vor Frue Kirke on August 12, 1537, establishing a precedent which has since been quite consistently followed in crowning regal rulers in Protestant countries, as recently in the case of Queen Elizabeth II of Great Britain.

Not only did Luther appeal to the princes in matters pertaining to the appointment and support of pastors and approve orders issued in the name and by the authority of the princes, but in his very earliest efforts to help provide for local church government, he turned to the city mayors and councils, approving city-church orders, and recommending pastors to be called by the mayors and city councils for the congregations within their jurisdiction. The city-church system of church government first made its appearance where the Lutheran Reformation had taken hold, but it was soon expanded into the state-church system, with city churches integrated into the state system and placed under its general supervision

7 M. Currie, ed., *Letters of Martin Luther*, p. 333.

8 Absolon Tranger, *Norsk Kirkiret* (Kristiania, 1910), pp. 52-56; Fabricius, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 195, 196.

9 Fabricius, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 262, 288-92.

through superintendents and consistories appointed by the princes. The consistories were general administrative bodies composed of civil and ecclesiastical representatives and invested with general supervision and management of all ecclesiastical affairs, presided over and directed by a representative of the secular government. The first such consistory was established by an order in 1542, known as the *Constitution und Artickel des geistlichen consistorij zu Wittenberg.* It was based on a treatise by Justus Jonas on the establishing of ecclesiastical consistories and was promulgated in the name and by the authority of Elector John Frederick of Saxony. It provided for three consistories—Wittenberg, Zeits, and Zwickau—each with a somewhat different composition. The one at Wittenberg was to be composed of four *Commissarien* (two theologians and two jurists), one *Fiscal,* one *Notarius* with alternates for same, and two oath-bound messengers (*Bothen oder Cursores*).[10] This, too, in Luther's day and with Luther's knowledge and consent, and right in his home town!

While Luther may not have had any part in the composition of the first Luther-approved city-church order, that of Leisnig of 1523, he at least wrote a preface for it, recommending it to the people of Leisnig and expressing the hope that it might become an example to others. He advised the temporal authorities to take over the possessions of monasteries and foundations and apply the proceeds in the following three ways: "First, to support the persons remaining in them. Second, to provide those who leave with sufficient funds to find a position and make a fresh start in life. . . . But the third way is the best, namely, to devote all remaining possessions to the common fund of a common chest, out of which gifts and loans might be made, in Christian love, to all the needy in the land, whether nobles or commoners."[11]

This order provided for a governing council of ten men, two "honorable" men (nobles), two from the city council, three from the general citizenry, and three from the rural community. This council was to have authority to call pastors, provide for their support, maintain church property, provide for schools, maintain order and discipline, and administer the general affairs of the congregation, including its treasury and provision for the sick and the needy.[12] In letters to Elector Frederick of Saxony under date of August 11, 1523, Luther requested him to approve and confirm this order[13] in order to put an end to the controversy there.

Luther, it is true, was not at first very much concerned with things external. With him the preaching of the Gospel in its truth and purity and the administration of the sacraments in accordance with their nature and purpose as set forth in the Word of God were the prime and chief concerns. Referring to the question of casting out images from the churches, as started by Carlstadt in Wittenberg, he wrote to Count Louis of Stolberg under date of April 25, 1522,

10 Richter, *Kirchenordnungen,* I, pp. 367-75.
11 *Works of Martin Luther,* Philadelphia ed., IV, pp. 94, 95.
12 Richter, *Kirchenordnungen,* I, pp. 10-15.
13 WA, *Briefwechsel,* III, p. 124.

"We must destroy this and other false beliefs by preaching, so that men's hearts may be drawn away from them by the pure Gospel; the external thing would then go to pieces of its own accord, because it helps nobody."[14] This is also evidenced by his reluctance to prepare liturgies and his retention of so many of the old elements when he finally yielded to pressure and produced his German and Latin orders of worship. His Treatise on Good Works (1520), Address to the German Nobility (1520), Right and Power of a Christian Congregation or Community (1523), and Secular Authority (1523), all, in one form or another, emphasize the same point. In his treatise on Secular Authority he even went so far as to assert, naively and unrealistically, "If all the world were composed of real Christians, that is, true believers, no prince, king, lord, sword, or law would be needed. For what were the use of them, since Christians have in their hearts the Holy Spirit, who instructs them and causes them to wrong no one, to love every one, willingly and cheerfully to suffer injustice and even death from every one." The hard facts of his subsequent personal experience taught him that no such spiritual utopia existed anywhere, not even in an *ecclesiola in ecclesia!* While recognizing the right of a congregation to call and dismiss pastors, in his treatise on the Right and Power of a Congregation or Community, he also held that in case of necessity preachers might be provided "through the power of the secular authorities."[15] Such necessities he learned to recognize more and more clearly as he matured in practical wisdom and judgment and adapted himself to the world of reality in which he lived and labored.

It should be noted, however, that although Luther actively promoted the entry of city councils, princes, and other civil authorities into the affairs and management of the church, both in the local congregations and in the *Landeskirchen,* he nevertheless consistently maintained that the functions or calling (*Beruf, vocatus*) of state and church were distinct and different, the state having to do with temporal affairs and the church with spiritual matters; yet both were the ordinances of God and hence both were in his service. Therefore he wrote as he did from time to time to mayors, city councils, and princes, urging them to exercise the powers and use the resources of their respective offices in behalf of local congregations and the several state churches. Yet he felt at times that the secular authorities tended to go too far in assuming authority over the church and giving directives to the ecclesiastical authorities. In a letter to Pastor Daniel Greiser, Dresden, dated October 22, 1543, he complained bitterly about such unwarranted interference. Referring to the civil authorities, he wrote: "Either they must become pastors, preach, baptize, visit the sick, serve Communion, and carry on all church work, or else desist from mixing the different functions together (*vocaciones confudere*), mind their court affairs, and leave the congregations to those who have been called to minister to them, and who shall render an account to God for

14 Smith and Jacobs, *op. cit.,* II, p. 122.
15 *Works of Martin Luther,* Philadelphia ed., IV, p. 82.

their ministry. We want the functions (*vocaciones*) of the church and the court to be kept separate, or both will perish. Satan continues to be Satan! Under the pope he mixed the church with the state; now he mixes the state with the church. But by the grace of God we will resist and do what we can to keep the functions (*vocaciones*) separate."[16]

The final conclusion of Professor Karl Müller, of Tübingen, appears to be well founded on the basis of historical evidence: "Although Luther's views were subject to continuing development, the principles on which they rested remained the same from beginning to end. The development which took place resulted simply from the adaptation of his principles to different circumstances and conditions. . . . When it became clear that individual congregations were unwilling and incapable of taking the initiative and helping themselves, more and more responsibility was transferred to the princes, until finally complete authority was given to them in the visitation. Thus the foundation was laid for what later became and was called the *landesherrliche Kirchenregiment.*"[17]

MOTIVES FOR CONVERSION IN THE MISSION OF ST. ANSKAR

By Allen Cabaniss

UNDER the leadership of St. Paul, expansion became a foremost mark of the Christian church; so much so, indeed, that one of the most popular gospels attributed to the very lips of the Founder a solemn command to his disciples to convey the message of the new religion to all the world (Matt. 28:19). An American denomination (the Presbyterian Church in the United States) has emblazoned upon its banner the legend, "Missions is the mission of the church." This world-wide movement has been made the subject of a multi-volume survey by Professor Latourette, in which we see that the spread has not always been even nor always successful.[1] Advance and retrenchment have often followed each other, sometimes rapidly, at other times slowly. As a consequence, one inevitably raises the question of motivation. What was the appeal of the new religion? With what techniques did it try to convert non-Christian peoples? Once having secured adherents, was it invariably able to hold them? Or were there motives strong enough to recall the new converts to their old beliefs?

For the period from Alexander the Great to St. Augustine, this question of conversion has been studied by Professor Nock.[2] But, as he intimates near the

16 WA, *Briefwechsel,* X, p. 436.

17 Karl Müller, *Kirche, Gemeinde und Obrigkeit bei Luther* (Tübingen, 1910), p. 80.

1 K. S. Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity,* 7 vols. (New York: Harper, 1937-1945). Vol. II, pp. 113-118, contains a brief discussion and bibliography of Anskar.

2 A. D. Nock, *Conversion* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1933).

end of his book, an investigation of the same problem in later eras of history would be equally valuable, and not the least so during the days when the Carolingian empire was at its zenith. Charlemagne himself was a zealous, often brutal, propagandist for the Christian faith, but in many instances an effective one. Less drastic were the methods employed by his son, Louis the Pious. The most important result of Louis's sponsorship was the mission of St. Anskar, the so-called Apostle of the North (801-865). Twenty-five years old when he began his activity as a missionary, Anskar spent almost forty years in that work among the Danes and Swedes, from his base of operations, the sees of Hamburg and Bremen. To him we now direct our attention.[3]

Converted to the religious life at the age of five by a vision of the Virgin Mary (2), Anskar was profoundly affected eight years later by the death of Emperor Charles. Shortly after that event he had another vision, deeply colored by the language and imagery of the Apocalypse, in which he was admonished by Christ to go forth but to return crowned with martyrdom (3). In still another vision, Christ declared to him forgiveness of all his sins (4). In this latter visitation, Christ had appeared "dressed in the Jewish fashion"—a remarkable note of threefold import: it is evidence that Anskar was not moved by feelings of discrimination against those of other nationalities; it is reminiscent of the high favor in which Jews were held at the court of Louis the Pious; and it is suggestive of the realistic quality of Anskar's dreams. So it came to pass that in 826, when Louis, thrilled by the baptism of the Danish King Harold, asked for someone to go to the northern lands, Anskar ardently volunteered.

The emperor's foster-brother, Archbishop Ebbo of Rheims, who had already made a preliminary missionary survey of Denmark, was enthusiastic for the project, but, strangely enough, few other persons were. Even Anskar's fellow-Benedictines tried in every way to discourage the future apostle. So strong was the opposition that only one young monk, Outbert, was willing to accompany Anskar (7). But Anskar himself was of stedfast determination; he spent virtually

3 The main source of information about Anskar is the *Vita Anskarii* by his associate and successor, Rimbert; see the edition by G. Waitz, *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum ex monumentis Germaniae historicis* (Hannover: Hahn, 1884), pp. 13-79. To simplify documentation, I have incorporated into the text of this paper, at the appropriate places, numbers which will indicate the pertinent chapters of the *Vita Anskarii*.

Although all quotations from the *Vita* in the text are my own translations, there is a complete translation by C. H. Robinson, *Anskar: The Apostle of the North* (London: S.P.G., 1921), which has a good introduction (pp. 7-21) and bibliography (pp. 22-24). I therefore see no need here to present a list of publications which antedate Robinson's book. Since that time, the best study is a very fine monograph by E. de Moreau, *Saint Anschaire: un missionaire en Scandinavie au IXme siècle* [Louvain: Editions du Museum Lessianum (Section Missiologique No. 12), 1930]. But see also H. Rafn, *Ansgar* (Copenhagen: Det Danske Missionselskab, 1926), and P. Oppenheim, *Del heilige Ansgar und die Anfänge des Christentums in den nordischen Ländern* (Munich: Max Hüber, 1931). An informative general account is J. T. Addison, *The Medieval Missionary* (London: International Missionary Council, 1936); pp. 17-19, 29, 100-102, 150 f., contain remarks about Anskar's mission.

the remainder of his life in the northern lands (34), bolstered by yet anothe vision in which Christ confirmed his intention and bade him, "Go and proclain the Word of God to the nations" (9). Never once in later life did Anskar falte in his purpose.

The first knowledge of Christianity which these northern peoples had wa derived from captives whom they had taken on some of their raids. War, in spit of its waste and cruelty, was as usual serving its part as a medium of cultura interpenetration. Rimbert, biographer and successor of Anskar, relating the initia activity of his hero at the Swedish port of Birka, implies that Christian prisoner had paved the way for the missionary (11). Precisely how, he does not reveal but we may assume that it was by word of mouth and by example. The importanc of this quiet lay-evangelism must not be underestimated, for there were—and are— never enough clergymen to accomplish the vast task.

Many of the earliest converts by their example also aided the spread of th Christian religion. Rimbert gives two singular instances. One, the story of Herigar the chief official of Birka and an intimate of the Swedish king, is narrated at som length (11). Although left for long periods of time without religious ministra tions, Herigar maintained his belief in the face of reproaches. Once during a council of his people, he dared to test the strength of his new God against th old gods and was, like Elijah on Mt. Carmel, rewarded by an apparent miracle Similarly, when seriously ill, he confounded his opponents by invoking divin aid and by being healed in their presence. Again he was able by shrewd Christia advice to avert an attack on Birka. Fortunately Herigar was visited by a pries and was permitted at the end of his life to receive the final sacraments (19).

The devout woman, Frideburg, is another illustration. She, too, in spite o urgent pressure, held to the faith she had professed at baptism. Her case is al the more notable because of the paucity of her information about the new creed Bereft of the services of her religion, she had for three years preserved in a special vessel some wine (unconsecrated, of course) which she instructed he daughter to drop on her lips as she died. The simple woman had heard of Viaticum and was thus trying in her guileless way to be ready for a Christian death Fortunately she was also visited at last by a priest and was allowed to depar from earth with the consolation of the sacraments (20). The loyal testimon of such layfolk as Herigar and Frideburg surely accounts, far more than we ca ever imagine, for the ultimate conversion of the Scandinavians to Christianity.

The introduction of learning—the traditional learning of the Hellenic-Roman Christian culture of the Mediterranean region—was another means of appealing t the Scandinavians, and St. Anskar exploited it zealously. We are told that on of his first undertakings was the founding of a school in which twelve or mor boys were trained (8, 15). In troubled times he carried books with him whereve he went. Two very severe losses, the theft of forty of his books by pirates (10 and the burning of others during an attack on Hamburg (16), are recorded b Rimbert as catastrophes which could hardly be repaired. Anskar himself devote

precious time, as Rimbert also did later on,[4] to the copying of manuscripts for the mission library and in composing works of his own (35). That these books impressed the mind of the men of the North is clear from the story of a pagan who had stolen one of them. As disaster after disaster fell upon him, he tried earnestly to rid himself of the volume, but none of his friends would accept it. As a last desperate measure, he fastened it to a fence with a notice that anyone who wanted it might have it. A Christian neighbor took the book to his house and, when the missionaries chanced to pass through that region, he returned it to them. He himself adopted the religious life so that he could learn the Psalms by heart and repeat them for the remainder of his days.

The influence of Christian prisoners, converts, and learning is evidence that the conversion of the northern Europeans was by no means motivated entirely by force, political wangling, or the desire to curry favor with their southwestern and southern neighbors. Thus far indeed the story sounds much like the apostolic spread of earliest Christianity. However, we may not ignore the presence of certain external reasons for a mission in the ninth century, as in all other centuries since the church entered the field. The interest of the Carolingian rulers was undoubtedly important. In fact, as we have seen, Anskar's mission grew out of their concern (12, 22). Papal prestige also was not without significance and was duly conferred on Anskar to assist him (13, 23). Moreover, the approbation of the Danish (7, 24) and Swedish rulers (9, 11, 26, 28) was of profound usefulness to Anskar, as their disapproval was a severe hindrance (31), and as the decay of Carolingian power ultimately hampered the mission (21).

There were times, nonetheless, when a ruler's favor could not override popular disfavor. A noteworthy illustration occurs in the record of a persecution in which it is specifically mentioned that the plot was devised by the people without royal knowledge or sanction (17, 26). In another instance a Swedish king found it necessary to secure a favorable reaction of two separate assemblies of his people gathered at two different places (27). Thus, although official royal assistance promoted, it could not compel, the success of the mission. "For among us," asserted one ruler to Anskar, "it is customary for public business of any kind to rest on unanimous consent of the people rather than on royal decree" (26).

The method of determining the outcome of a popular assembly is interesting: it was, of course, largely by debate, but the final decision was achieved by the casting of lots (19, 27). However much Christian moralists have frowned upon the appeal to chance as savoring of idolatry (in this case it was indeed considered by the pagans themselves as an appeal to their old gods), the practice was too ingrained in the Germanic character to repudiate it.[5] As a matter of

4 The anonymous *Vita Rimberti* was edited by Waitz, *op. cit.*, pp. 81-100. The reference here is to Chapter 15. Very interesting, but not entirely pertinent for our discussion, is H. Rosenfeld, "Buch, Schrift und lateinische Sprachkenntnis bei den Germanen vor der christlichen Mission," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie,* Neue Folge, VC, 3 (1952), pp. 193-209.

5 Cf. Tacitus, *Germania,* 10, in H. Furneaux and J. G. C. Anderson, *Cornelii Tactii opera minora* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1939), *ad loc.* (no pagination).

fact, there is a degree of biblical sanction for it. Fortunately for Anskar's mission, the lots always favored it. Thus *Tyche* (or the Norns!) came to the aid of the new religion.

Christianity also appealed to the men of the northern countries as something in many ways useful and beneficial. Occasionally it saved a town from sack (19). An instructive account is that of the siege of Aputra by the Swedes (30). After eight days with victory not yet in sight, the Swedes decided to consult their gods by lot to learn whether victory would be forthcoming or whether the siege should be withdrawn. But the gods of the North demonstrated lack of interest in the affair. The Swedes, smitten with despair, now feared that the people inside the city might rally. At this impasse some merchants remembered what they had heard about the God of the Christians. Lots were cast again and it was discovered that Christ was attentive and would help. The Swedes therefore reinvested the city. At this moment the besieged decided to ask for a truce, to which the Swedes happily assented. In solemn thanksgiving later, the Swedes, although not Christians, offered to the Christian God a forty-seven-day period of fasting and gave the proceeds of the fast to the poor.

This unusual story is the only hint we have of economic motivation in the mission of Anskar. If there was any other evidence of that motive, it eluded, or was of no importance to, contemporary writers. The usefulness of the Christian religion had appealed to the pagan Northumbrians of the seventh century, as we see in the Venerable Bede,[6] but in that instance it was joined to a lively concern for what happened after death. In the case of the northern men of the ninth century, profitableness apparently applied only to matters of the present world. "Concerning the worship of this God," one of the Swedes counseled, "it is well known to many of us that he can afford great help to those who trust him. . . . Why, therefore, do we reject what we know to be needful and useful to us . . . ? For, when we cannot have our gods propitious to us, it is good to have the favor of this God who can and will, always and in all circumstances, aid those calling on him" (27)—a crude, but effective and indeed scriptural, line of reasoning.

Thus, in addition to the examples of Christian people and the transmission of traditional learning, we have some political influence, but, even more, belief in immediate benefits, as motives for the conversion of the Scandinavians. However, we have not yet touched the main reason for Anskar's success. Above all else, humanly speaking, it lay in the life of the man himself. A Danish king publicly testified that Anskar was the best and most trustworthy man he had ever seen (26). That assertion is a justifiable description of the holy missionary as well as we can discern. His devotion had been recognized from early childhood (2). In the midst of arduous duties, Anskar maintained the practice of regular meditation and, as long as his health permitted, rigorous austerities. His entire life was inspired by the gracious example of St. Martin in making a special effort to be

6 Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*, II, 13, in J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae cursus completus: series latina*, XCV, 103D-105B.

of service to ordinary folk. His excessive generosity to the poor and his indiscriminate hospitality to those in need gained for him many grateful followers. Even attention to study was not neglected by him (35), and like St. Paul of old, he believed that missionaries should labor with their own hands for food and clothing (33). There is no cause for wonder that he was admired and beloved by all who knew him.

St. Anskar also made a lasting impression by his preaching and pastoral care, fulfilling the admonitions of Gregory the Great. His sermons are said to have had a special charm, his hearers being persuaded that his words were divinely inspired. He presented equally well both sides of divine revelation, the mercy of God and his stern justice. His biographer says that his speech was appealing and that his appearance was striking (37). Like most medieval men, he had the "gift of tears" and a quick, hearty compassion which expressed itself in immediate demonstrations of sympathy (35).

According to Rimbert, the whole life of Anskar was attended by revelations and by miracles. From beginning to end the visions were so frequent that it would hardly be worthwhile to recount all of them again. Some of them were quite extraordinary (25, 29) and only one of them was not realized: he had been promised martyrdom, but that was denied him, although Rimbert strains to make the point that Anskar, like St. John the Evangelist, was a martyr in will if not in deed (3, 42). However, as a Danish historian of the nineteenth century has aptly remarked: "The only reward that he coveted for his fatigues—the palm of martyrdom—was not to be his; but what was the sorrow of the apostle ought to be the glory of the North, that it did not soil itself with his blood."[7] Even Anskar's pious hope that he would die on the feast of the Purification was refused; he died a day later (41).

Of his miracles, Anskar himself preferred that they not be related. "If I were worthy to stand before God," he stated humbly, "I would ask that he grant me one miracle only, namely, that by his grace he make me a good man" (39). Miracles are nevertheless recorded not only of the missionary, but also of his converts and assistants, usually various miracles of healing. Sometimes there were a few miracles simply as a means of proving the might of the Christian God. Once Herigar, by prayer, caused rain to fall on the pagans, but to leave himself and a small boy dry (19). Frideburg's daughter was granted the marvel of an ever-replenished bag of alms-money (20). The obstinate ones who defiantly harvested in the fields on a holy day found that their heaps of grain were destroyed by fire from heaven (37)—a motif often met in folklore. But it must be observed that miracles were not as prominent in the mission of Anskar as his visions were, although the chief extant work of Anskar himself is his account of the miracles of St. Willehad, first bishop of Bremen.[8]

There is one curious little by-path that may have more significance than is

7 Cited in Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

8 Anskar's *Vita sancti Willehadi* is given by Migne, *op. cit.*, CXVIII, 1013A-1032B.

usually credited to it by way of marvel or folklore. It is here merely noted parenthetically. Only casually alluded to by Rimbert, it is the agreement of an unfriendly ruler to allow a bell (*clocca*) to be put up in a church despite the fact that the pagans regarded the use of the bell as unlawful (32). Here certainly is a folkloristic motif, but the real meaning is not apparent. Much later, the biographer of Rimbert recounts that Anskar had had a dream in which Rimbert was seen joyously ringing a bell (*quod nos cloccam vocamus*). The dream was interpreted to mean Rimbert as a bishop preaching. This far-fetched explanation was accomplished by recourse to Exodus 28:33-35, which was given an allegorical elaboration: the colors and alternating bells and pomegranates of the dress of an Aaronic highpriest were analyzed in the following manner. The pomegranate, by its very nature, suggests multifarious duties and virtues bound together by the bond of charity; the color hyacinth, desire for heavenly matters; purple, readiness for martyrdom; scarlet, flaming love for God and neighbor; and white linen, patience and humility in fasts, vigils, prayers, and reading. The bells and pomegranates are mingled because sermons are seldom needed apart from the virtues which commend the preacher to his hearers.[9]

The results of Anskar's mission were small; the real conversion of Scandinavia came later. But it is surely erroneous to state that "this first introduction of Christianity was too closely bound up with the political and diplomatic relations of northern Europe. Sharing their vicissitudes, the mission led a feeble life, and finally succumbed.[10] To answer that criticism, we may tabulate no less than

9 *Vita Rimberti,* 7. This is surely not the place to append a disquisition on bells, however fascinating the subject is. See H. Leclercq, "Cloche, Clochette," in F. Cabrol and H. Leclercq, *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie,* III, Part 2 (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1948), cols. 1954-1977; J. G. Frazer, *Folk-Lore in the Old Testament,* III (London: Macmillan, 1919), pp. 446-480 (Chapter VII, "The Golden Bells"). Leclercq, *op. cit.,* col. 1961, states on the evidence of only one reference: "Saint Anschaire . . . vulgarise les cloches dans son diocèse." It is obvious that in the work of Anskar and Rimbert the significance attached to bells is of great, but obscure, importance.

I direct attention to an additional reference, practically contemporary with Anskar. Amalarius, *Liber Officialis,* III: i: 4, 5, 7[J. M. Hanssens, ed., *Amalarii episcopi opera liturgica omnia,* II (Studi e Testi, No. 139; Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1948), pp. 258-260], using the correct Latin word, *signum,* instead of the Germanic *clocca,* states that the bell signifies preaching: the sonorous metal itself is the mouth of the preacher; the clapper, his tongue; the cord binding the clapper to the bell, his moderation or modesty; and the rope by which the bell is rung, the measure of his life. It is worth remembering that Amalarius was the episcopal dedicator of the church at Hamburg (*ca.* 811; see *Vita Anskarii,* 12). Moreover, his successor at Trêves, Hetti, and his superior at Metz, Drogo, were two of the bishops assisting at Anskar's consecration (*ibid.*). To establish a connection between Amalarius, on one hand, and Anskar and Rimbert, on the other, apparently very close, would be a tantalizing problem. I add further that a bell seems to have figured prominently during the elaborate baptismal festivities of King Harald in 826, at which Anskar was presumably present; see Ermoldus Nigellus, *De rebus gestis Ludovici pii,* IV, lines 400 f.: Interea missarum aderant jam sacra parata, More vocat *signum* ad culmina sacra homines. . . .

10 Addison, *op. cit.,* p. 29.

seven motives which persuaded the people of the North to become Christians during the almost forty years of Anskar's mission: the influence and example of Christian prisoners and converts, the Christian educational program, political leadership, chance, the apparently direct intervention of the Christian God, the life of the missionary (his spirituality, friendliness, generosity, and hospitality), and his preaching. Are not these the reasons customarily found on any mission field? Every one can be paralleled today almost eleven hundred years after the death of St. Anskar. Certainly every one can be paralleled in the spread of Christianity during the eight hundred preceding his death.

JUSTUS FALCKNER'S ORDINATION CERTIFICATE

By Willem J. Kooiman

ON NOVEMBER 24, 1953, 250 years will have passed since Justus Falckner was ordained at Wicaco (Philadelphia) as minister of the Dutch Lutheran Church in America by the Swedish provost Andreas Rudman. The certificate of this ceremony is the oldest record of a Lutheran ordination in America and is therefore of great value as a historical document.

Two copies of this document are known. One, entirely in script, was rediscovered in 1925 in New York City and is now deposited in the archives of the Lutheran Historical Society, Gettysburg, Pa. The second was published by Julius Sachse in his biography of Falckner; the greater part of it is in printed form and only the last paragraph is in manuscript. Sachse makes it appear that he found this document in the archives of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Amsterdam, Holland.

Various investigators have occupied themselves with the mutual relationship of the two documents. Which is the original? M. G. G. Scherer was of the opinion that the New York copy is the original certificate.[1] Karl Kretzmann believed that the Amsterdam copy deserves the honor.[2] Harry J. Kreider decided in favor of the New York copy,[3] while A. J. F. VanLaer supposed the Sachse facsimile to be an imprint of a copy to be found in Sweden.[4]

However, various difficulties remained. In the first place, there were deviations in the text, although in general they pertained only to the variant use of equivalent Latin terms. In the second place, the dating of the two copies and the

1 M. G. G. Scherer, "Ordination Certificate of Justus Falckner," in *The Lutheran World Almanac, 1924-1926,* pp. 44 ff. A reproduction of the New York copy appears here.

2 Karl Kretzmann, "Justus Falckner," in *Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly,* X, 3 (October, 1937), pp. 75 ff.

3 Harry J. Kreider, *Lutheranism in Colonial New York* (1942), p. 31.

4 *The Lutheran Church in New York, 1649-1772,* Records in the Lutheran Church Archives at Amsterdam, Holland, translated by Arnold J. F. VanLaer (1946), p. 102.

form of the signature varied. In the third place, why the New York copy existed entirely in script while the Amsterdam copy was partly printed was a question that remained unanswered. And behind all these questions was the basic one: For what reasons had two differing official documents been drawn up in 1703?

The solution of the whole problem is simple but remarkable. The Amsterdam copy, as published by Sachse, does not exist. His "facsimile" is a falsification.

What are the actual facts? The original certificate which was stored away by Falckner in the archives of the Dutch Lutheran Congregation (Trinity Church) in New York was, at the time Sachse wrote his biography on the occasion of the bicentennial of Falckner's ordination, not to be found in spite of many years of searching.[5] How Sachse must have rejoiced when in connection with his investigations in the Amsterdam archives he came across a transcript of a part of the document in the handwriting of Falckner himself. The fragment consisted of the beginning and the end of the original text, which Falckner had sent to the consistory of the Dutch mother congregation[6] for the purpose of convincing the home church that he had been legitimately called and ordained. He added that the text of the remaining part, which he did not copy, was the same as the official formulary of ordination used by the Lutheran Church in Upsala at that time.

Convinced that the original diploma would never be found again, Sachse then reconstructed the whole document with the help of Falckner's partial transcription. From a Swedish original of the eighteenth century he reproduced the first part of the formulary and appended the last paragraph in the handwriting of Falckner. The signatures of the pastors performing the ordination—Andreas Rudman, Ericus Tobias Biörck, and Andreas Sandel—he had found some years earlier on other documents,[7] and the reproduction of these signatures he substituted for the three names Falckner had written under his transcription.[8] This latter he was able to do with great skill. With less astuteness, however, the seals for the pseudo-document were arranged. The lack of copies of the seals of the three Swedish ministers was overcome by reproducing Falckner's own seal, which he found on one of the envelopes in the Amsterdam archives, and which he placed after each of the three signatures. He forgot, however, that in the use of a seal, the wax does not solidify in exactly the same shape in three successive instances. The fact that the three seal impressions have precisely the same form is itself an

5 See J. F. Sachse, *German Pietists of Provincial Pennsylvania* (1895), p. 376; T. E. Schmauck, *The Lutheran Church in Pennsylvania* (1902), p. 118.

6 Judging from the paper and ink he used for the transcription, it is highly probable that he did not send this copy to Amsterdam before 1713, and then to the address of the Rev. Bernhardus H. Empzychoff. Cf. the close of Falckner's letter to the consistory, June 9, 1713 (VanLaer, p. 105 f.), where he speaks about his "letter *and the enclosures* to the Rev. B. H. E." The dating, November 1703, in VanLaer (p. 101 f.) is therefore incorrect.

7 He had already published these signatures elsewhere. Cf. J. F. Sachse, "Genesis of the Lutheran Church in Pennsylvania, II," in *The Lutheran Church Review,* XVI (1897), p. 290.

8 One can observe that under his transcription, Falckner had already somewhat imitated the handwriting of the signatures of the three clergymen, but that was not sufficient for Sachse.

indication of forgery. It is remarkable that none of the earlier investigators observed this fact.[9]

Apart from this, however, it is quite understandable that historians should have been misled by Sachse's work. It is cleverly constructed throughout. And the caption is as follows: "The official certificate of ordination of Dom. Justus Falckner. . . ."[10] The way in which he refers to his discovery is so veiled that one does not observe on the first reading that there is something wrong. With a sense of accomplishment he wrote: "A facsimile of Justus Falckner's copy of the original ordination is now for the first time presented to the American reader."[11] He published a reproduction of what was nothing other than a trick photograph. The sentence which follows the one cited above is in strong language: "The writer will also state that this has been certified to as correct and authentic by the highest Lutheran episcopal authorities of Sweden," while in the prologue he expresses his gratitude to the Archbishop of Upsala "for the verification of the diploma of ordination."[12] In Upsala, naturally, it was impossible to deny that the reproduced text was indeed the one used in the Church of Sweden for such a ceremony.

From various evidence it follows that the New York copy is not only the original one but also the only existing copy of the ordination certificate as an entity. This document was written by Andreas Sandel[13] and signed the day after the ordination. In the partial copy sent to Amsterdam, Falckner avoided the discrepancy of the two dates, the 24th and the 25th, by adding *"Dab. ipso inaugurationis die Anno 1703"* and by omitting the date of signature.

The minor differences in the first part of the text probably rest on the fact that the Swedish ministers in America had at their disposal another edition of the ordination formulary than that which Sachse used for his falsification. In the

9 John G. Glenn, "The Certificate of Ordination of Justus Falckner" in *The Lutheran Church Quarterly,* XX (1947), p. 424 ff., who gives an English translation of the original certificate, says about the Amsterdam copy, "Apparently Falckner made a copy of the original certificate and had Pastors Rudman, Bjoerck, and Sandel sign the copy and affix their seals as on the original." It is very evident that the latter is not the case. Scherer had already observed that the seal of Falckner occurred three times, but he did not also notice that the shape of the wax was exactly the same on all three.

10 J. F. Sachse, *Justus Falckner,* between pp. 74 and 75.

11 *Ibid.,* p. 74.

12 *Ibid.,* p. 3.

13 Scherer, *loc. cit.,* p. 44, says that the original document is written by Rudman. Kretzmann says: "From a long acquaintance with Falckner's writing as found in the New York church records we are convinced that the New York copy of the diploma is entirely in the handwriting of Falckner, with the exception of the three signatures." Both are mistaken. There is no doubt about the handwriting of Andreas Sandel. One notices, for example, the way in which he wrote the "P" in "Pensylv:" under his signature; this remarkable "P" occurs in exactly the same form in the text in the fourth line from the bottom. There are more of these similarities. One can also conclude from this that Sandel, as the first of the three, signed at the bottom of the sheet and left more space above his signature than necessary, so that between the signature of Biörck and Sandel there is an extra amount of space.

last paragraph, which Falckner transcribed and sent to Amsterdam, only two modifications occur, not including the point of the date. Before his name he adds *"Dom.,"* and he omits *"Germanus"* after it. This is understandable if one remembers to whom the document is addressed. It is equally evident why the Sachse "document" is partly printed and why the titles appearing beneath the signatures of the three officiating clergymen there are in the handwriting of Falckner and at the same time why they differ from the original.[14]

One charitable conclusion which might be arrived at is that Sachse, with his eye on this "facsimile," correctly wrote in the title of his book: "Compiled from original documents, letters, and records at home and abroad." The accent in this case must be placed on the word "compiled."

Fnally, in this investigation the *corpora delicti* are not missing. The archivist of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the Netherlands, Dr. Simon Hart,[15] succeeded in finding in the Amsterdam archives the actual photographic negatives of the Falckner transcription and the positives of the wax seal with which the fraud was perpetrated. With this—to end our detective story in true style—the offender is proved guilty and (to say it in a Dutch detective phrase) the circle of this investigation is closed.

LUTHER ON THE CHRISTMAS PROPHECY, ISAIAH 9

By Carl Umhau Wolf

MARTIN LUTHER is noted for his commentaries and for his polemics. His Genesis and Psalms, Romans and Galatians are perhaps the best known commentaries. But much of the best in Luther is to be found in the notes, reports, and summaries of his sermons. In his forceful preaching, which pulled no punches, the light of the Word shines forth brilliantly, and the heart of Reformation theology is underscored. The festival preaching of Luther is a far cry from the sentimentalization and paganization of much of our modern pulpit. In his Christmas preaching alone, one is able to discover without effort the entire summation of his Christian faith. Even in the use of the Old Testament, the Gospel stands forth. Even in preaching of the child of Bethlehem, the Saviour of Calvary is glorified.

About thirty-two sermons of Luther on Old Testament texts for Advent to Epiphany are recorded in the Weimar edition of Luther's works. Six are Advent

14 Glenn says that the signatures in both documents are "identical." This is not entirely correct.

15 On June 15, 1952, Wagner College conferred the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws upon Mr. Hart in recognition of his work in transcribing the Dutch records relating to colonial New York Lutheranism.

sermons based on Genesis 12, 27, and 28. Nine are for Epiphany Sunday, using as texts Psalm 72, Isaiah 9:2-7, 60:1, and Micah 5. The remainder are from Christmas Eve, Christmas Day, St. Stephen's Day, and St. John's Day. In all these the Isaiah 9:2-7 text predominates. But Isaiah 7:14 and 60:1 also are used. Other Old Testament texts were used on the day of Circumcision and on the several Sundays after Epiphany. These Old Testament sermons date from all periods of Luther's life, from 1519 to 1545.

The majority of Luther's sermons in this festival season are on Isaiah 9, one of the few Old Testament texts that by a type of "ecclesiastical license" are called Epistles. This is the "Epistle" for Christmas Day. By far the most extensive record of Luther's sermons on this text is from the year 1526 (WA, 19:131 ff.). In 1519 Luther preached several sermons from the same text with only a few repetitions in content (WA, 34^2:490 ff.). Curiously, the notes from his lectures on the book of Isaiah are quite sketchy and have little to offer on the interpretation of the Christmas message (WA 31^2:68 ff.).

The Relevance of Isaiah 9 to the Christmas Message

Since Isaiah 9:2-7 is the Christmas pericope, Luther makes the most of it in his preaching. He frequently preached several times during the same season on this text. In 1544 he noted how closely it ties in with the Gospel lesson (WA, 52:578). To Luther there is never any doubt that this prophecy concerns Christ. The child is Jesus Christ (1526: WA, 19:131). "The prophet predicted the birth of Christ with clear and significant words" (1537: WA, 45:341). "This is a beautiful prophecy of Christ and his kingdom long before its coming" (1537: WA, 45:341).

The chapter is significant to Luther because it tells much more than the bare birth narrative of the Gospels. The meaning of the incarnation in the affairs of God and man is not neglected when Luther interprets this text. "The whole passage throughout is of the kingdom of the Christ child, how he reigns and what comes of his rule" (1526: WA, 19:131). The incarnation points to the cross. "This is a rich chapter. It tells of the birth of Christ and of his reign. It declares to whom he belongs, namely, to me, to you, and to all who believe. It states what he has done, how he came down to earth for us, and suffered for our sins, and bore them on the cross. Also how he bears us up daily through the Word and sacraments. It describes the kingdom, and in the six names tells how he organizes his kingdom" (1531: WA, 34^2:515 ff.).

What is to be Emphasized in Preaching this "Epistle"

Luther has a short memorandum on what should be emphasized in preaching on this text (1537: WA, 45:426). This forms a fine guide for sermons in the

spirit of the Reformer. Luther settles on four points that must be emphasized again and again.

1. *"Unto us."* Personal pronouns have always been known to have had great importance to Luther. He does not overlook them in his sermons on Isaiah 9. In the throes of the Reformation's struggle for existence Luther could hardly escape the temptation to polemics even on Christmas. The "unto us" is given a new "democratic" and universal slant in contrast to contemporaneous Mariolatry and papalism. "A child is born, and to whom? To us! Not merely to the Virgin Mary, but to all his fellows, brethren, Jews, and others. He is born to us men on earth. This young child in a crib in Bethlehem is your child sent and given to you" (1531: WA, 34^2:491). The miracle "to us" is almost as great as the virgin birth. "Most children are born to their parents; only this child is born to us all. . . . No matter how many other thousands are born, only this one can help us" (1526: WA, 19:132 ff.). We who are deep in sin and in the toils of the devil are the recipients of this gift of grace (1537: WA, 45:426). Therefore such a gift cannot be ignored. The word *uns,* "to us," is quite important. "We should write these three letters UNS as high as heaven and earth" (1531: WA, 34^2:490 ff.). But such a gift demands a strong faith and a sincere response in love (1526: WA, 19:132 ff.).

2. *"Born."* This child is not an angel or any other creature of God. He is a man like unto us. He has our nature (1537: WA, 45:426). The humanity of Christ is emphasized in these Christmas sermons. "He is a natural man, born of woman with flesh, blood, bone, marrow, hair, head; one who lives, moves, stands, acts as all men do, and yet without sin" (1526: WA, 19:132 ff.). This humanity was vital because man needed someone of his own nature to help and comfort in sin (1541: WA, 49:195).

3. *"Son is given."* The word *nathan* in Hebrew is frequently mentioned in Luther's sermons. This gift is of grace, *sola gratia.* Man has not merited it by his works nor, because of his sin, deserved it (1537: WA, 45:427). The Son given by God must therefore also be God. Jesus is the God-man. He is not just a servant great as Moses, but the Lord himself.

4. *Three tyrants destroyed.* The text referring to the breaking of the yoke is interpreted by Luther as reflecting the destruction of the three tyrants. The birth of the child suggests the life and victory of the Cross and the resurrection. The rule of sin is broken. The yoke of death is destroyed. The law which condemns has been subdued (1537: WA, 45:341 ff.). Yet Luther does not abandon the law and interpret the "end of the law" as entire freedom. "With Christ the three enemies are conquered. Not that law, sin, and death are done away, but that the law no longer condemns, sin no longer terrifies, and death does not consume" (1541: WA, 49-211). In some other sermons and interpretations not on this text Luther calls the three tyrants: sin, death, and the devil.

WANTED: FIRE-BRANDS

By W. O. Doescher

> I journeyed to the Suburbs, and there I was told: We toil for six days, on the seventh we must motor to Hindhead or Maidenhead. If the weather is foul we stay at home and read the papers. —From "The Rock," by T. S. Eliot

SUBURBIA is the habitat of middle-class America, and America, we are told, is a middle-class country. In truth, however, America is but symptomatic of western civilization in general. The Marxists distinguish between bourgeois and proletarian man, but these are only varieties of the same genus of which the *ne plus ultra* specimen is proletarian man. He is the man of Suburbia as regimented by technocratic dictators. Suburbia, therefore, is not only America in miniature, it is technical civilization in miniature. Since the turn of the century Suburbia has even transformed Gopher Prairie into its own image. Asphalt highways, high-speed cars, radio networks, Hollywood movies, cocktails, television, and chain stores, have abetted the victory of urbanization over the autonomous country village. The quiet, halcyon days are no more.

Some time ago I had occasion to go to Maywood, Chicago, on one of those indecisive days consisting of intermittent drizzles. The sun could not decide to shine nor the clouds to storm. As a friend dropped in to greet me I remarked tritely, "Maywood seems to be a pleasant spot." His reply was, "Yes, Maywood is a typical middle-class town." Maywood also contains a theological seminary to which many pastors come in summer for study and refreshment. One of these pastors from a large suburban church observed that his most baffling problem was to pierce the hard, protective crust behind which suburban man shelters his complacency, like a tortoise avoiding danger. Here, it seemed to me, was a coincidence of symbol and reality—a parable of modern life—that pointed to Christianity's most difficult and challenging problem. In Suburbia the religious weather neither rains nor shines. It is an intermittent drizzle interspersed by diffused flares of feeble sunlight. Yet it is symbolically appropriate that a school of the prophets should be set in the midst of Suburbia. For unless the church can convert the man of Suburbia it will lose its struggle for the soul of western civilization. The church must light a fire in Suburbia.

To ask, "What is Suburbia's faith?" implies an overemphasis: it were better to ask, "What are Suburbia's unconscious predilections?" They are those of a shallow and conventional hedonism. Suburbia studiously shuns pain and avoids conflict. It pursues a steady course of calculated prudence, common sense, and normalcy. It is convinced of the value of bathtubs, refrigerators, sex, and fire insurance; but it suspects religion of being but transcendental moonshine, which, like chiropractic or astrology, may be cautiously tried in case other expedients fail.

Suburbia seeks to conceal the grim realities of life behind pleasant illusions.

It is embarrassed by the obscene improprieties of nature. Old age, for example—which is man's ripening for the grave—is banished in Suburbia behind the masquerade of perpetual youth. It is zealously disguised by means of liberal applications of cosmetics, wave-sets, bridgework, and face-liftings. The tragic mystery of the life cycle is hardly felt in Suburbia. The wonder and pain of birth is hidden behind the obstetrical facade of the delivery room and the maternity ward—from which fathers are strictly forbidden. The tragedy of death and the stark ministrations that once required men to contemplate the hideous and pathetic paradox of human dissolution are now consigned to the secret chambers of the professional "mortician." If Suburbia even knows the facts of life, it does not permit itself to reflect on them.

Thus the stream of life in Suburbia rushes along like a shallow freshet. Its surface is agitated and often choked by a plethora of mediocre concerns. With Mr. Prufrock it ponders "Shall I part my hair behind? Do I dare eat a peach?" With Carl Sandburg's "Lady on Maxwell Street," it "is terribly glad to be selling fish, terribly glad to be selling fish." Suburbia's wisdom is expressed in classic maxims: "Don't stick your neck out." "Keep your shirt on." "So what!" Its tepid emotions know neither the desolation of grief, nor the exaltation of heroism or grandeur. In Suburbia the noble Ulysses, as James Joyce shows us, shrinks to the insipid Mr. Bloom. Suburbia has never glimpsed the terrible majesty of God. It therefore dares to be self-confident, unafraid, and amiably self-indulgent. Its anemic soul knows neither generous enthusiasm nor humility. Because it is incapable of ardent hero-worship, it is equally incapable of repentance.

> And the wind shall say: Here were decent Godless people, their only monument the asphalt road and a thousand lost golf balls.

In short, the man of Suburbia, though he lives over an abyss of unfathomable mystery, has no sense of the infinite depth of his existence. (Not discerning the abyss he knows no metaphysical awe. Surface is all, all is surface.) Though moving relentlessly toward eternity, he has no sense of life's meaning or direction. Though loved by the living God, this allegation strikes him as a tale that is told and awakens in his heart no answering gratitude nor high praise. It is this man of Suburbia, whether he be sophisticated, Laodicean, or ordinary lukewarm mediocrity, who is neither hot nor cold, that must be set on fire for God, lest God spew him out of his mouth. His problem is the problem of the west. His problem is our problem.

How can one light a fire in Suburbia? Only by first becoming the Lord's fire-brand. If we are not on fire ourselves, we shall set nothing ablaze. Alas, we, too, being members of Suburbia, are not very combustible. The glow in *our* hearts barely flickers. We, too, are tainted with Suburbia's fitful secularism, its unimaginative fact-grinding, its lack of ardor and passionate commitment, its preoccupations with means, its pursuit of the secondary and the relative. The

Zeitgeist of our technical and commercial age has laid its cold, paralyzing hand over the spirit of modern man and dried up in us the well-springs of mysticism, of wonder, and of reverence. No splendor of God drives us to our knees. It is this enervation of the human spirit which God must cure if contemporary life is to be delivered from frustration and boredom.

What is needed, first of all, is a recovery of the sense of depth, a consciousness of that Infinite on which our transitory and frail existence rests. Modern urban life has no sense of the infinite. The dimensions of Suburbia are superficially horizontal, not vertical. In every direction of life this horizontal view terminates on human gadgets and man-made contrivances: on concrete, steel, machinery. In the canyons of Megopolis even the sky is a thin streak of emptiness whose stars are blotted out by street lights and neon signs. Thus man's divorce from nature and the elements has hidden from him the Infinite that really engulfs him. Note that the Infinite is hidden from Suburbia, not absent. Modern man does not know that he is in reality using God's world—its divine matter and energy—with a human ingenuity that itself comes from God. Unaware that both he himself and his world belong to God, the man of Suburbia complacently accepts both physical nature and human nature without gratitude. There is nothing to adore and nobody to thank.

Modern man takes all surface appearances for granted. The disenchantment of familiarity and the obsessions of getting, spending, and doing have emptied his heart of wonder and concealed from him the elementary mystery, the shocking contingency of existence. Science, though it presents the most astonishing and improbable facts for contemplation, has—through this familiarity that breeds contempt—stunted all capacity for perceiving the miraculous. Meanwhile, careful and troubled about many things, Suburbia forgets the mutability and frailty of all things finite. Clearly Suburbia needs to hear an authentic word from on high. Its lethargy needs some prophetic Childe Roland to blow a mighty blast on a spiritual slug-horn for God. Suburbia does not need wholesalers and retailers; it needs prophets who can announce the transcendent. What, then, would a prophet have to say to Suburbia?

One of the great words that needs preaching at this hour is simply the first article of the Creed, "I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth." That this word is known or understood cannot today be taken for granted. It needs to be heard again in both its ancient forms: the Word addressed to our eye in creation, and the Word addressed to our ear in revelation. Only then will the splendor of God again shine forth. The church's preaching must restore to modern experience the note of sublimity and infinity. It should make known the Almighty, the Eternal, the Unfathomable—who spreadeth out the heavens as a tent, who looseth the bonds of Orion and guideth Arcturus and his sons, yet who knoweth our frame and remembereth that we are dust while he holds us in the hollow of his hands. Nature mysticism, the sense of our organic kinship with creation, is not the monopoly of transcendentalism or of romantic pantheism. It

is a valid aspect of Christian experience involved in the creative immanence of God in nature. It is God, says Jesus, who clothes the lilies of the field in all their glory. It is God who sends his rain and sunshine upon the just and the unjust. So nothing is in nature that was not first in God, whether discerned in the wing of a bird, the fearful symmetry of the tiger, the strength of steel, the energy of the atom, the power of the Diesel locomotive, the smile on a child's face, the sublimity of the galaxy. Could this knowledge of God be recovered by Suburbia, it would be as a trumpet call that awakes the sleeper from his sleep. Suburbia does not need sociologists and logicians; it needs poets.

What Suburbia needs, in the next place, is to recover a sense of the meaning and direction of life. In some quarters life has even ceased to be a "tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing." After all, an idiot *thinks*, however fantastically. By and large, for modern man life has become, in the words of Bertrand Russell, but an aspect of "Omnipotent matter rolling its relentless way, . . . the trampling march of unconscious power,"

> . . . that reasoneth not
> on putting forth all things begot—for what?
> O Loveless, Hateless!—past the sense
> of kindly eyed benevolence
> To what tune danceth this immense?
> For one I cannot answer. But I know
> 'Tis handsome of our pities so to sing
> The praises of the dreaming, dark, dumb Thing
> That turns the handle of this idle show!
>
> (Hardy, *The Dynasts*)

"Idle show!" says our faithless and melancholy poet. Yet from out of the midst of all our bustle and busyness, almost drowned by the chatter of our theories, propositions, scientific reports, and statistics by the clank and clatter of our machine, comes the voice of one who says,

> I am come that the eternal purpose of God may be fulfilled in you, that ye may have life and have it more abundantly. Verily, God so loved the world that He gave Himself, even to the extremity of anguish and of death, that thou, O man, should'st not perish, but have everlasting life. Let all who will enter the tabernacles of God to become the sons of His household, and the heirs, with Christ, of all things which God has prepared for those who love Him. Come, accept the water of life freely without money and without price, for none who accept the invitation are cast out. Come! Enter the banquet of God and celebrate with the King of Kings, the Lord of Lords.

Such is the startling news which this Voice proclaims. It is indeed the voice of God speaking incarnate in Jesus Christ. This good news truly solves the riddle of history. It lifts the burden of suffering and death. It reveals at once the sublime origin of life, the transcendent meaning of our existence, and the glorious purpose that God condescends to accomplish in us.

If Suburbia could be induced to listen to the naked splendor of this news, this *kerygma,* would it not cease to be incredulous? "Too good to be true," says the sophisticated. Nay, we reply, true *precisely* because it is so good, so stupendous, so novel, so beyond the wildest dreams of men, in short so *divine* that only God would think of it. This, then, is the Word that needs to be preached: "I believe in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord."

Finally, Suburbia needs to recover a sense of vocation. It needs a cause to serve that has absolute, not ephemeral value. Only such a cause can exalt life. This is not to say that the humdrum details of daily living can be avoided. Dishes must be washed, Grand Coulee Dam must be built, the carburetor must be adjusted, the blast furnace must be fired, the floor must be scrubbed. But if Suburbia could be induced to accept the high meaning of life contained in the Gospel, it would discover again the unity that gives meaning and greatness to the common life. For thereupon, as parts of our divine vocation, all these activities—the trivial as well as things "of great weight and moment"—become invested with profound meaning and importance. God is no respecter of size. He is in the little as well as the big. He speaks not only in earthquake or whirlwind, but in the still, small voice. He speaks in the humdrum of life. This is the Christian secret of life. The release from boredom and mediocrity is not to be found in romantic escapism, but in that inwardness of life that results from the knowledge that God may be served and his name glorified in every detail of life. Thus is the common life transfigured and given dignity and greatness—yes, in suffering, too, given an heroic grandeur. All of life may be holy, especially the simplicities of human fellowship and the homely chores of daily work. This, too, is the word that needs to be preached: "I believe in the divine spirit of holiness and the communion of saints."

Suburbia's malady is not beyond the reach and power of God, if only his preachers and prophets can be aglow with its truth, its freshness, its relevance, its incandescent power. Be a fire-brand! Start a fire in Suburbia!

THEOLOGY AND WORLD LUTHERANISM

By Vilmos Vajta

AFTER eight years of Lutheran cooperation in the practical areas of relief and rehabilitation, the time seems to have come to begin conversations among Lutherans throughout the world which might serve to deepen and strengthen their fellowship with one another in the unity of their common faith and confession. The new Department of Theology was established by the Lutheran World Federation in Hannover (1952) for this purpose.

It is no secret that there has often been considerable scepticism in the church with respect to theology. Many think that there is no need for theology, that it is just an obsession of a few so-called experts which has nothing at all to do with

the living church. And it must be conceded that this accusation has found some support in the work of those theologians who have isolated their theology from the message and mission of the church. But in the real sense of the word, theology is the church's responsibility to preserve the pure preaching of the Gospel and the right administration of the sacraments. This responsibility cannot be carried out without a continuing study of the Scriptures, of the Confessions, and of the whole history of the church's preaching and teaching.

The consciousness of a close relationship between church and theology requires that the new Department of Theology must make clear the relevance of theology for congregational life. Of course, it will be necessary to make the scientific work of theological faculties accessible on an international scale. But ultimately the clergy and laity of the church must be confronted realistically with the results of theological research.

The work of the Department of Theology must begin with an attempt to establish cooperation and coordination. Already existing channels and mediums of theological cooperation must be cultivated. If the Department can function as a clearing house for the coordination of projects already under way in various countries, more will be achieved than by attempting to set up new projects. This does not mean that new projects cannot be proposed, but it means that all theological projects must grow out of the actual needs of member churches.

It is important that we realize at the outset that many difficulties must be overcome. In some cases it will be easy to carry on an international theological discussion. In other cases the weight of tradition and historical background will make mutual understanding difficult to achieve. What is needed is honest theological conversation which is marked by a readiness to face differences which exist within the framework of a basic Lutheran unity. In this day, especially, when Lutheran theological traditions are confronted by vigorous non-Lutheran theological traditions, the underlying unity which actually exists among Lutherans must be made manifest.

We Lutherans must try to discuss our differences candidly. It is not enough for each of us simply to restate his traditional position. There must be a willingness to review and reexamine what Orthodoxism, Pietism, and Liberalism may have to say on important questions of our time. A mere repristination will not free us from the responsibility which rests upon us to give our own answers. It is a fact that Lutherans are speaking in different theological languages, and accordingly it is imperative that we discover the unity which lies behind them. We must be willing to listen to opinions and expressions which may be unfamiliar to us. Some may be unwilling to review their traditional positions in the belief that the church will be weakened by raising questions. The truth is probably quite the opposite: by insisting that traditional formulations are self-evident and by refusing to reexamine them, the church will die.

Traditions never have the same meaning for succeeding generations that they had for their originators. Churchmen who repudiate the obligation to make

continuing and fresh studies in the Scriptures are unfaithful to the heritage of the Reformation. Accordingly our theological conversations must be supported by the confidence that a discussion of existing differences in point of view cannot be a danger to the church. On the contrary, we must believe that God can use our conversations and use the Department of Theology to bring about closer unity in faith. This does not mean that we desire theological uniformity (which would put an end to theological inquiry) but rather the unity which comes from being captive to the same truth and seeking the same treasure. Then unity will not consist of adherence to common human traditions but will be a fellowship in the life-giving Christ, the living Word of God.

Because some Lutheran bodies are not officially represented in the Lutheran World Federation, all theological traditions are not represented. It would of course be desirable to hear the voices of those who are outside the Federation. The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod is a case in point. I am happy to report that the men I met at Concordia Seminary in St. Louis convinced me of their interest in the work of the Federation's Department of Theology and their readiness to enter into theological conversations with their fellow-Lutherans. But the Missouri Synod is just one case. There is another voice, probably less homogeneous, in union churches. Men who regard themselves as Lutheran although they do not belong to official Lutheran bodies need to be heard, too, if they are not to be completely alienated.

Only tentative indications can be offered at this time as far as a program of the Lutheran World Federation's Department of Theology is concerned. Activity may be expected in three major areas.

1. *Study work.* By means of correspondence and special conferences Lutherans will be able to make their contribution in preparation for the assembly of the World Council of Churches which is to meet in Evanston, Illinois, in 1954. The theme, "Jesus Christ, the Hope of the World," will be explored, as will subsidiary topics which are also to be discussed in Evanston. Connected with this is the whole problem of the relation of Lutherans to Christians of other confessions in the ecumenical movement, a subject which is in need of further theological investigation. By means of correspondence and special conferences the attempt will also be made to pursue the study of the relation of church and state, attention having been focused on this problem by Bishop Berggrav in Hannover.[1] In like fashion it is felt that there is need of a thorough theological investigation of the practice of public worship, divine service, and liturgics.[2] The Department of Theology will

1 See Eivind Berggrav, "Church and State—the Lutheran View," in THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, IV, 4 (Nov. 1952), pp. 363-76. A helpful step in the desired direction is the study "Toward a Lutheran View of Church and State" in THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, V, 3 (Aug. 1953), pp. 280-90.

2 A stimulating contribution toward this study is George E. Mendenhall, "Biblical Faith and Cultic Evolution," in THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, V, 3 (Aug. 1953), pp. 235-58.

serve as a clearing house for information and as a guide to further study in the fields indicated.

2. *Exchange of personnel.* There is need of an exchange of professors of theology who might communicate the results of their investigations to Lutherans in other countries. Provision should be made to offer guidance and help to exchange students. The exchange of pastors, who might study congregational life in foreign countries, is also desirable. Such exchange programs cannot be put into execution, however, without the financial support of member churches.

All who have themselves had some experience as exchange personnel will agree that sacrifices made in this way can become blessed capital for the future of our churches and for the fellowship of world Lutheranism.

3. *Translation and publication of literature.* Much that is highly commendable is already being done in this area, but more needs to be done. Literature is a major means of communication and, therefore, every possible encouragement must be given to the translation of ideas from one people and culture to another. Existing periodicals will be used in so far as this is possible to inform Lutherans, including lay people, of the work of the Department of Theology and of theologians generally.

THE FACULTY CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP

By Harold A. Dunkelberger

WITH its first national conference just completed, The Faculty Christian Fellowship has come to sufficient age and stature to merit the notice of the American churches. Its emphasis, as its name implies, lies on fellowship rather than organization. Briefly stated the purpose of the F.C.F. is "to cooperate with all existing Christian groups in carrying out a program of fellowship and discussion among professors of colleges and universities regarding teaching as a Christian vocation, the opportunities which are theirs for developing the whole life of the academic community, and the implications of the Christian faith for the various curricular disciplines." While related to the Commission on Christian Higher Education of the National Council of Churches for its administrative services, the Fellowship maintains for the present a fresh and healthy autonomy of expression and action.

This autonomy was well illustrated in the first national conference, held June 18-22, 1953, at Park College, Parkville, Missouri. There were no delegates from board or denominations as such at Parkville; there were no official findings to be binding on anyone; there was no steam-roller technique to accomplish business. There was rather an effort toward utilizing every possible opportunity to increase fellowship and understanding across the barriers of widely divergent teaching disciplines and widely separated denominational attitudes. Yet with decidedly contrasting convictions developing at times into heated arguments, there was an

over-all cohesion of Christian love suggesting that the Holy Spirit was present and at work.

The conference was pitched on a high level, both from a religious and an intellectual standpoint. Some in attendance felt that they were being stretched, continuously, almost beyond their capacity to try to keep up. Here is a brief sampling of the intellectual caliber of addresses. Professor Theodore A. Greene, of Yale University, speaking on "The Contemporary Challenge to the Christian Scholar" posed the proposition that Greek culture at its summit, the Hebrew-Christian tradition, the genuine scientific search, and the true democratic ideal gravitate toward three fundamental themes: process, person, and piety. Francis Miller, a candidate for the United States Senate from Virginia in 1952 and a member of the Advisory Commission of the World Council of Churches from the Presbyterian Church, South, spoke on "The Social Responsibility of the Christian Professor." Challenging those who claim that the intellectuals, Christian or otherwise, must maintain their stance in their ivory towers, Miller insisted that there is a religious and political treason in staying in the towers while the fight for freedom and justice go by default. Professor E. Harris Harbison, of Princeton, in an address on "Christian Perspective on Intellectual Freedom" documented his contentions that while Christian freedom is to be asserted in the face of the law as an institutionalized church or an ideological, scholastic theology, we are letting "the Book Burners" take freedoms away to enable us to go on to our catastrophe while they give us happiness instead of freedom. Stimulating in their own way also were the presentations of Professor T. S. K. Scott-Craig, of Dartmouth, on "The Christian Professor and His Colleagues," and Professor Amos Wilder, of Chicago, on "Christian Perspectives in Current Literature."

Yet more impressive than its intellectual caliber was the emphatic theological cast of most of the presentations and discussions. If a main theme of the conference could be discerned at all, it was focused around the four addresses of Daniel Day Williams, professor of Systematic Theology at Chicago Theological Seminary. These addresses on basic Christian affirmations bore the titles: "Biblical Faith and Scientific Knowledge," "Man in the Light of Christ," "Christian Love and Social Justice," and "History and Human Destiny." In a somewhat different theological tempo and dialect were the address and incidental remarks of J. V. Langmead Casserley, recently associated with Sir Arthur Moberley and the English Dons movement and now professor of Dogmatic Theology at the General Theological Seminary, New York City. From a third point of view came the incisive chapel meditations and discussion remarks of the Conference chaplain, Alexander Miller, native of New Zealand and now professor in the Humanities Program at Stanford Unversity. There developed out of these presentations in the seminars and discussion groups a very stimulating three-cornered debate among those who tended to follow Williams and a kind of process theology, those who sought a faith-reason reconciliation along the lines of current Anglican Thomism, and those, with Miller, who found Neo-Orthodox affirmations most convincing.

To hazard a few observations, it would appear that on the college and university level, Christian professors seem somewhat confident that the natural and social order bear humanly discoverable elements of their Maker's pattern, that there is a valid area for Christian apologetics and natural theology. It would appear, also, that there was general consensus that Christian professors, whatever their teaching discipline, must become "lay theologians"—equip themselves both to know the basic Christian affirmations and to exemplify these in their living and their philosophy of teaching.

Of the approximately one hundred and fifty professors in attendance from every part of the country, fifteen were Lutheran. While Lutherans of practically every branch were present from the Middle West, only three Easterners were bold enough to venture into the prairie climate, theological and otherwise. Four professors were actively present from St. Olaf College, Northfield, and represented the best turn-out of any Lutheran institution. Although there were no Lutherans on the speakers' roster, they took a significant part in the program and activity. Howard V. Hong, professor of Philosophy at St. Olaf, is the newly elected secretary of the Faculty Christian Fellowship. Professor Hong and the writer were discussion leaders in the morning seminars following Professor Williams' addresses on affirmations. Grace E. Wilson, of the Music Department of the University of Illinois, aided in the coordination of music for the Conference and played for the corporate worship.

Where will the Faculty Christian Fellowship move from this point? Present plans call for regional conferences, somewhat along the line of this year's national conference, in the years immediately ahead. There will be intensified effort to develop groups on campuses who will study the foundations of our Christian faith and the relevance of these for their teaching disciplines. There will be special effort to cooperate with efforts made by specific denominations along this same line, so that there may be a paralleling of effectiveness without conflict of interest. Throughout there will be effort to support and strengthen the Christian professor, "standing fast in the liberty with which Christ has made us free," to do his most effective teaching, and thereby witnessing.

Book Reviews and Notices[1]

This Is The Church. Edited by Anders Nygren. Translated by Carl C. Rasmussen. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1952. $4.75.

This series of nineteen essays on the general theme of the Church, contributed by fourteen Scandinavian theologians and edited by Anders Nygren, was first published in Sweden in 1941. The two contributions by the revered editor are among the very best in the volume.

Through the book there runs a particular emphasis on the scriptural truth that the church is the body of Christ, i.e., a living organism, and that we as members of the church stand in vital relation with Christ and our fellow-Christians. Giving this truth its deserved place in the teachings of the church is a real service. We admit there is something intriguing about the thought, and one is tempted to let one's fancy run and draw conclusion upon conclusion from this concept of the church. A reminder may be in place to the effect that "body of Christ" is but one of many terms which Scripture uses in speaking of the church. The church is "kingdom of God," "the temple of God," "a royal priesthood," *ekklesia.* All these designations are figures of speech, and none is to be exploited at the expense of the rest.

With this concept of the church in the background and bringing it into relation with the incarnation (Christ the second Adam) it is shown how Luther's doctrine of the Lord's Supper is not an isolated notion of the Reformer but of one piece with his entire theology. The concept of the "body of Christ" is disrupted if we deny that Christ can be bodily present in the Sacrament. This approach also throws light on Luther's statement that the unbelieving communicant receives only the body and blood of Christ while the believer receives the whole Christ.

Plainly the contributors represent different confessional positions. To cite but one example, we find a complete gamut of statements concerning the Lord's Supper—"The body and blood of Christ are present," "My body equals myself," and "Bread and wine represent the body and blood of Christ." One contributor makes John 6 the chief source for the study of the Sacrament.

One appreciates the emphasis placed on the objective character of the means of grace in the essay "The Subjective and the Objective in the Concept of The Church." But should there not be more consideration given to the fact that God deals with us as personalities? One wonders at a statement in another essay which seems to run in the same line of thought—"there is really no essential difference between a view which makes the church the sum of the personally believing and one which makes it the sum of the baptized."

One delights in the many fine offerings from the writings of Luther. Without having the present volume particularly in mind, sometimes the question arises: Are we Lutherans in danger of making more of Luther than of Scripture?

We have in *This Is The Church* a wealth of stimulating material, a real contribution to our theological literature, for which the authors and particularly also the able translator and the Muhlenberg Press deserve our thanks.

EMIL W. MATZNER

The Theology of Paul Tillich. Edited by Charles W. Kegley and Robert W. Bretall. New York: Macmillan, 1952. 370 pages. $5.50.

This is the first volume of a new series entitled *The Library of Living Theology.* The editors aim to do for present-day the-

1 Books reviewed or noticed in these pages may be purchased through your church's publication house.

ology what Professor Schilpp has done for philosophy, namely, to select thinkers of first-rate importance and to give not only a thorough exposition but also a critical analysis and evaluation of their thinking from as many points of view as possible. They have adopted the admirable plan originated by Schilpp: (1) An intellectual autobiography by the thinker himself, (2) A series of essays by competent critics presenting an interpretation of various aspects of his thought, (3) the subject's replies to his critics, and (4) a complete bibliography of his writings. The man whose thought is being examined thus comes alive for the reader, and the power and validity of his thinking may be assessed by the impact which it makes on a number of scholarly minds with divergent backgrounds and interests.

For the first theologian in this enterprise the editors could hardly have made a better choice than Paul Tillich. Dismissed by Hitler from his professorship of philosophy at the University of Frankfurt, he arrived in this country twenty years ago "without even a minimum knowledge of the language" (p. 16). Here in his mature years, as professor at Union Seminary, through strenuous mental travail and deepening spiritual insight, he has become one of the foremost theologians of the century. So penetrating is his genius, so comprehensive his design to interpret the relevance of Christianity for every phase of culture, and so quickening his influence, that many compare his significance for our day to that of Augustine, Aquinas, and Schleiermacher, for theirs. Whether one agrees with him or not, here is a man who must be understood and reckoned with.

In his essay "Tillich's Role in Contemporary Theology," Walter M. Horton describes him as "standing always 'on the boundary' between opposing views: between Barth and Hirsch, between American empirical theology and European dialectical theology, between Protestantism and Catholicism" (pp. 45-46). But he points out that Tillich is not a "mediating" theologian who merely steers a middle course and seeks to extract the least common denominator but a truly creative thinker whose system, despite its stresses and tensions, has the tensile strength to hang together. It is this ability to combine antitheses into a new living synthesis, coupled with the breadth of his interests, that makes Tillich predominantly a theologian of cultural reconstruction. Tillich's contribution to the understanding of secular culture is specifically treated by Theodore M. Greene, who points out the implications of "the Protestant principle" and of "kairos" for science, art, and history. Just as appreciative but more critical is Theodor Siegfried of Marburg, who in discussing "The Significance of Paul Tillich's Theology for the German Situation" seeks clarification on the relation of authority to autonomy and theonomy and questions the adequacy of Tillich's Christology. The theologian promises to give a full answer to the latter question in the second volume of his *Systematic Theology*.

George F. Thomas, dealing with "The Method and Structure of Tillich's Theology," asks whether the existential method tends toward anthropocentrism without giving a proper place to ethics. John H. Randall, Jr., head of Columbia's department of philosophy and representative of an outlook entirely different from Tillich's, criticizes the theologian's ontology but concludes: "Paul Tillich seems to me not only the ablest Protestant theologian of the present day, but also by far the most persuasive exponent of the philosophy of existentialism" (p. 161). The critical attitude continues in David E. Roberts' "Tillich's Doctrine of Man" and Charles Hartshorne's "Tillich's Doctrine of God." The former questions the distinction between God as ground of essence and as ground of existence and is perplexed by Tillich's ability to "engulf distinctions without blurring them." The latter seeks to define God as "process-itself" rather than "being-itself."

Two writers represent British reactions to Tillich, Dorothy M. Emmet analyzes epistemology and revelation, finding difficulty with the apparent irrelevance which historical research has in Tillich's search for truth. Robert H. Daubney discusses the liturgical implications of Tillich's thought, with particular reference to the demonic motif and the "Gestalt of grace."

Reinhold Niebuhr is concerned chiefly with Tillich's treatment of the fall and original sin. Characterizing Tillich as the Origen of our day, Niebuhr points out that in Tillich's thinking biblical revelation is colored by original ontological speculation. A. T. Mollegen's exposition of "Christology and Biblical Criticism in Tillich" has, according to Tillich himself, "a clarity which I have myself found it very difficult to achieve" (p. 348). In discussing Tillich's concept of the church, Nels F. S. Ferré calls attention to the antisupernaturalistic character of Tillich's whole system. But Ferré's own attempt to identify the Kingdom and the Church draws the sharp criticism: "This is not even Augustinian (and far less is it Reformation) theology" (p. 348). Tillich is at his clearest in answering James Luther Adams' eight questions on his interpretation of history. In the final essay, Eduard Heimann interprets Tillich's religious socialism and criticizes his attempt to combine Christianity and Marxism.

Tillich's replies to his critics are given in a humble, frank, and grateful spirit, which is an appropriate reaction to the overtone of praise and appreciation discernible in all of the essays. Perhaps the purpose of the book would have been served better if some of the critics had been less friendly. Tillich's answers to criticisms from the point of view of Lutheran orthodoxy would have been interesting reading.

In any case, here is a highly informative and stimulating book which should find its way into the library of every seminary and college, every professor of theology and of philosophy, and every pastor and student who is at all interested in living theology.

T. A. KANTONEN

God Hidden and Revealed. The interpretation of Luther's *deus absconditus* and its significance for religious thought. By John Dillenberger. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1953. 193 pages. $2.50.

Dr. Dillenberger, associate professor of religion at Columbia University, analyzes in this book one aspect of Lutheran theology which has been dwelt on very little in America, but which has been discussed by a number of leading theologians in Europe. The great problems of the book are: Why is it that God reveals his mercy in the wrath manifested in the cross of Christ, and his power in the extreme weakness of Christ's suffering and death? Why are God's ways with men often so incomprehensible? Why can one person become a believer and not another?

Luther struggled with these questions, and particularly with that of the mystery of divine predestination. He came to the brink of utter despair, but he also received a deep insight into the ways of God. The solutions which Luther found to these most puzzling problems of human existence have been interpreted in different ways. Dr. Dillenberger's book is a historical study of these various interpretations. He follows the treatment of these concepts of Luther through the writings of such men as Albrecht Ritschl, Theodosius Harnack and his son Adolf von Harnack, Reinhold Seeberg and his son Erich Seeberg, Rudolf Otto, Ferdinand Kattenbusch, Emil Brunner, Karl Barth, etc. Included in this historical survey is a systematic study of the hidden and revealed God and an evaluation of the various interpretations of this concept. Dr. Dillenberger seems to be close to Barth in his understanding of the matter and, like Barth, he is severe in his criticism of the Ritschlian interpretation, which he regards as wholly inadequate.

Dr. Dillenberger's book provides a fresh clue to the situation of theology today. Its weakness is that it does not discuss at all the interpretation of these aspects of Luther's theology given in recent times by the Scandinavian and Finnish Luther study. This is obviously due to a lack of knowledge of these languages.

Nevertheless, Dr. Dillenberger's book sheds valuable light on some crucial question of theology and practical Christianity. We are particularly pleased with his emphasis on the dynamic character of divine revelation. It is not man who "discovers" God, neither is it human decision which makes one a Christian. Only when God speaks to man and gives him a vital experience of his judgment and mercy, is a true faith born in

the human heart. God reveals himself to man when and where he wills. Yet, this freedom in the operation of God's mercy can never be taken as an excuse for irresponsibility.

Dillenberger's book is interesting and enlightening reading, and in the main we find ourselves in agreement with the author. In the foreword Paul Tillich says that even interested laymen who have mastered minimal theological concepts will find Dr. Dillenberger's book indispensable. Maybe this is true. We doubt, however, whether there are many laymen who will be able to understand much of the book. Even the pastors in most cases find that, in some parts at least, it requires real study and meditation in order to be understood. But to him who does not fear this sort of work the reading of this book will prove rewarding.

UURAS SAARNIVAARA

Studies in Lutheran Confessions. By Willard Dow Allbeck. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1952. 306 pages. $5.00.

The decades after the First World War have witnessed a great revival in theological interest in the person and teaching of Luther. This so-called Luther-renaissance seems to have arrived in America too in recent years. Another great movement in the same period has been the ecumenical movement, which had its Faith and Order Conference in Lund in August of 1952. The theological commissions of the Faith and Order Conferences have done intense work in studying the doctrines and practices of the various branches of Christendom. This study has had a somewhat unsuspected effect: It has not resulted in compromises between the various denominations; rather, it has led to a reawakened confessional consciousness in the respective churches.

The revival of interest in the Lutheran Confessions that has been evident after the Second World War seems to be a part of this general awakening of confessional consciousness in Christendom. The Lutheran Church sees more clearly than before its mission as a witness for the truth in the midst of the doctrinal confusion that is prevalent in Christendom. Lutherans are now studying the symbolical books of their church with a greater interest and reverence than previously. One of the evidences of this fact is the publication of a number of theological works on them.

In America, about a quarter of a century has passed since J. L. Neve published his works on the Lutheran Confessions. Dr. Allbeck's book *Studies in Lutheran Confessions* is therefore badly needed and to be sincerely welcomed.

Edmund Schlink points out in his book *Theologie der lutherischen Bekenntnisschriften* (3d ed., 1948) that the symbolical books can be dealt with in different ways: One can study the history of their origins and influences, their occasion of writing, preparatory works, final formulation, acceptance, etc. Several notable theologians have worked in this field of the historical study of the Lutheran Confessions. Or one may pay attention to the contents of the symbolical writings: what they teach, what is their terminology, inner systematics, relation to the theology of the ancient and medieval church, attitude toward the other branches of the Reformation movement, etc. Neither of these methods, says Schlink, takes the symbolical books in the sense in which they were written, as confessions of faith. The Lutheran Confessions want to be, and were intended to be by their writers, an authoritative interpretation of the Scriptures, an exposition of the saving Gospel, rediscovered by the Reformation.

Dr. Allbeck seems to make an attempt to use the golden mean between these various methods. He discusses first the attitude of Lutherans toward the *Book of Concord* and its significance in the Lutheran Church. Then he deals with the Ecumenical Creeds and after that, in the bulk of the book, the actual Lutheran confessional writings. In each case he gives a historical introduction, which contains a review of the occasion and circumstances in which each book was born and then an outline and discussion of the content. Proportionately longest is the chapter on the Augsburg Confession. This is natural, since this book is the chief confession of the Lutheran church. Relatively long is also the

chapter on the Apostles' Creed, in our view unnecessarily so.

In general the book is well written and gives a reliable and sympathetic account of the *Book of Concord.* The reader has the impression that Dr. Allbeck himself has owned the faith of the Confessions as his personal conviction and therefore is able to understand them "from the inside," which adds to the value of the book. The method which he uses has, however, one weakness: As he deals with the various books of the *Book of Concord* separately, the reader remains somewhat at a loss with regard to the total teaching of the Lutheran Confessions on the various doctrines. Many of the "articles of faith" are discussed in several books of the *Book of Concord,* and Dr. Allbeck gives no synthesis. Edmund Schlink's book, mentioned above, is better in this respect: he deals in a systematic manner with the teaching of the whole *Book of Concord.* In our opinion, Dr. Allbeck's book would be more useful if the "thematic" and not the "textual" method were used, to speak in homiletic terms.

We have only one criticism with regard to the actual content of Dr. Allbeck's book: He compares the teachings of the *Book of Concord* on the work of Christ to the interpretation of Gustaf Aulén (as if it were the most important one in recent times), and seems to find in them (we might say, read into them) more of the Aulénian interpretation than they actually contain (pp. 67, 70). It is hardly true that Luther understands atonement as victory, conquest, as Aulén thinks, although he uses illustrations which seem to point in that direction. Both Luther and the Lutheran Confessions are in this respect more scriptural than Aulén: Victory over the powers of evil is an important aspect of *Christ's work,* but it is not *atonement,* which is the removal of the guilt of mankind, the payment of its sin-debt. Victory over the powers of evil is closely connected with the removal of guilt, but it is not called atonement. The latter is practically synonymous with propitiation, expiation, reconciliation and redemption.

Allbeck, however, interprets the Lutheran Confessions at this point essentially correctly, for he shows that they include two main aspects in Christ's work: Removal of guilt, and victory over the powers of evil.

Allbeck's book is a valuable help in the study of the *Book of Concord.* As the author himself emphasizes, it cannot and should not take the place of a study of the Confessions themselves, but only intends to be a help in their study. The book will probably be widely used in theological seminaries, but it is valuable also to pastors and laymen who desire to have a better understanding of the teachings of the *Book of Concord.*

UURAS SAARNIVAARA

The Mystery of Love and Marriage. By Derrick Sherwin Bailey. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952. 145 pages. $2.

Sociological literature is replete with discussions of the nature, or of various aspects, of sex, marriage and the family. Unquestionably, this is a major source for most of our current concepts. Modern theological literature, however, with a few notable exceptions, has been rather deficient in its consideration of the biblical and Christian meaning of sex and marriage. Dr. Bailey's book is a valuable contribution in this area. Its sub-title is "A Study in the Theology of Sexual Relation."

Essentially this book revolves around an analysis of the biblical meaning of "one flesh." It is the author's contention that in sex and marriage a "one flesh *henosis*" is established which has ontological significance. The church has frequently yielded to the temptation of dealing solely with the institutional aspects of sex and marriage while ignoring their ontological reality. Yet it is primarily the latter which gives meaning to a Christian conception.

Because this book is closely written and exhibits comprehensive scholarship, it is hardly possible to do more than indicate its contents. The first part is an analysis of the unique character of the love which is the basis of the "one flesh *henosis.*" Among its elements are: (1) personal relation (dis-

cussed in terms of Martin Buber's "I—Thou" relationship); (2) a vision of perfection—which two lovers discern in one another and which is something of a reflection of the perfection of God; (3) fidelity—the sustaining aspect of the relationship; (4) physical attraction; (4) divine vocation and the work of the Holy Spirit; (6) the trichotomy of *eros, phila* and *agape;* (7) the tragic aspects.

The second part, "Union in 'One Flesh,'" deals with a host of fundamental questions on the basis of the idea that in the sex relationship a man and a woman establish a "biunity." Although this can be defective (as in fornication, adultery or even marriage without love), the radical character of the sex act, in what it does to the total beings of the persons concerned, is affirmed. Within marriage, sex has profound and fundamental meaning (even apart from procreation) in the establishment of "oneness."

In dealing with the difficult questions of the indissolubility of marriage and divorce, the book is completely free from a legalistic approach. Recognizing that the divine intent for both sex and marriage involves life-long fidelity, it is still stated with convincing argument that marriage cannot be regarded as absolutely indissoluble. When it comes to re-marriage, the author takes the position that the quest for "causes" or for "innocent" or "guilty" parties is (theologically speaking) futile. Rather, the criterion for the church should be that of repentance. Only on the basis of repentance is a new valid "one flesh" union possible.

This book is highly recommended for those who are willing to read carefully and who have some familiarity with theological concepts and terminology. It will seem like wandering in a strange country to others. The brevity of the book means that some ideas have been compressed too sharply for clarity, but this is a minor point in a work which is intended to be a contribution toward the beginning of re-thinking the meaning of sex and marriage in a theological context. The survey of church thinking on the subject is of real value. Since Dr. Bailey is an Anglican (recently chaplain to Anglican students in Edinburgh and now Central Lecturer, Church of England, Moral Welfare Council), his surveys of post-Reformation thought are confined to that church. The main thesis and argument, however, have universal appeal.

HAROLD HAAS

Jeremiah. By Theodore Laetsch. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1952. 412 pages. $5.00.

The publishers' preface in this book announces it as the first volume of a new commentary of the Bible to be produced by scholars of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod. The new series of commentaries thus begun is intended for students of the Bible generally, not only for ministers.

This first volume is on Jeremiah and the book of Lamentations. While not a critical commentary it is more than merely practical or homiletical. It aims to be truly exegetical and theological, and thus a help to every serious student of the Scriptures, including students who have learned the elements of Hebrew. For the special use of the latter class of persons there are frequent sections of grammatical notes on Hebrew words and phrases. For example, in the commentary on chapter 22 of Jeremiah there is an extended note on the proper name "Coniah." In the commentary on chapter 28 there are no notes on the Hebrew. On chapter 23 there is almost a full page of notes on the Hebrew words for "branch" and "righteous," and more than a full page, in double column, on the Hebrew original of 23:6. In general, the reviewer has found these grammatical notes pertinent, accurate, and full of interest, although somewhat unequally distributed.

We have said that this is not a critical commentary. By that statement we mean that little or no formal attention is paid to the usual questions belonging to the modern introduction of a book of the Bible, such as authorship, authenticity, text and versions, editorial transmission, history of interpretation, and related matters. Since Jeremiah presents some unique problems in the field

of introduction and since by its contents and its Greek version it offers unique materials for their partial solution, it is something of a disappointment that Dr. Laetsch has left them so resolutely to one side. His only introduction to Jeremiah consists of fifteen pages of "Introductory Remarks" which sketch the biblical-historical background of Jeremiah's life and work. Only three and one-half of these pages deal specifically with Jeremiah and these provide nothing more than an analysis of its contents. The much discussed question of the authorship and authenticity of the Foreign oracles, chapters 46-51, is completely disregarded. Once, in the body of the commentary, Dr. Laetsch crosses swords with Volz (p. 367) on the Jeremianic authorship of chapters 50 and 51.

In his introduction to Lamentations (pp. 375-376) the author pauses to discuss the critical question, acknowledging that "modern interpreters refuse to acknowledge Jeremiah as the author" and citing some examples. His own conclusion is that the traditional view of the rabbis and church fathers, that Jeremiah wrote Lamentations, is to be preferred, and that "similarities in diction and style" between Jeremiah and Lamentations and the "uniformity of spirit pervading both books" outweigh the differences in vocabulary between them (p. 376).

If this commentary is relatively weak on the critical side, it is strong, as we should expect from a scholar of the Missouri Synod, on the exegetical and theological side. The commentator labors throughout to give a plain and complete exposition of the text, not as the word of a man or of men, but as the Word of the Lord.

Dr. Laetsch adheres faithfully to the method of interpreting Scripture by Scripture. The result is an abundance of cross-references and of references to illustrative passages in the same book and in other books of the Old and New Testaments.

As might be expected, he does not share the critical opinion that the book found in the temple in the reign of Josiah (II Kings 22) was "the deuteronomic covenant" or the single book of Deuteronomy, about which so much has been written in relation to Jeremiah. In his comments on chapter 11 he adduces evidence that Jeremiah was acquainted not only with Deuteronomy but with the other books of the Pentateuch, and that he drew upon the complete Mosaic revelation. Because of these conclusions, Dr. Laetsch has no reason to question, as some scholars do, Jeremiah's authorship of chapter 11.

As a theologian our author adopts the principle that the study of an Old Testament book is not complete until its relationship and its relevance to the New Testament have been worked out. In the commentary on chapter 31, for example, there are at least forty-five references to New Testament passages. Of special interest in this section is Dr. Laetsch's attempt to establish 31:15 as messianic and in a messianic context. He rejects the view of many modern scholars that Jeremiah at this point was writing about the exiles of 721 B. C. or of 586 B. C. His attack upon the accepted view must be admitted to be weighty. Whether he has proved his own position it is not so easy to say.

This commentary appeared too soon to make use of the Revised Standard Version. The English text of Jeremiah and Lamentations printed here seems to be the author's own translation. In any future edition of the book it would be well if the translation should be identified. It is to be welcomed if it comes from the competent hand of the commentator himself.

Dr. Laetsch makes considerable but not fully adequate use of the work of other commentators. He cites frequently from a few older works like those of Calov and Schoettgen, and from Luther's German version and his other writings. He employs some German and English expositors of the nineteenth century, as Naegelsbach, Hengstenberg, Cowles, Cheyne, Plumptre, R. Payne Smith. He quotes German exegetes of the present century (Volz and Koenig) and some other German Old Testament authorities (R. Kittel, Sellin). There are infrequent references to American writers on Old Testament Introduction (Bewer, Pfeiffer). No use whatever seems to be made of standard Eng-

lish commentaries and studies on Jeremiah published since 1900. He relies consistently on the 15th edition of the Gesenius-Buhl *Handwoerterbuch veber das Alte Testament* but he makes no use of the new Koehler-Baumgartner Hebrew *Lexicon* which has been in the course of publication at Leiden since 1948. It is gratifying to find him paying attention to the archaeologists (Schrader, Koldewey, Duncan, Barton, Glueck, Albright, Burrows). Best of all he has not neglected the third edition of Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica;* and he quotes frequently from Rodkinson's *The Babylonian Talmud* and from other rabbinical sources.

There is a good topical index, but none of authors, or of the biblical phrases treated in the grammatical notes. There is no listed bibliography. No modern commentary except the most elementary kind is complete without these addenda.

In spite of limitations and omissions it is evident that our author has taken his task seriously and that the work has grown, as such works ought to grow, out of many years of unremitting special study and teaching. A deep spiritual earnestness is evinced on every page, and a personal Christian experience and faith as well.

The Concordia Publishing House is to be congratulated upon the attractive format and arrangement of this book, adapted as it is both to ready reference and to continuous reading. We shall look forward eagerly to the appearance of other volumes in this project.

WILLIAM H. COOPER

God's Order. The Ephesian Letter and This Present Time. By John A. Mackay. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1953. xii and 214 pages. $3.

In July of 1903, at a service held in the open air in a glen tucked away among the hills of Sutherlandshire in Scotland, a lad of fourteen had a "quickening" experience. Impelled by the experience, he dedicated the rest of the summer to an earnest restudy of the New Testament. Eventually his youthful interest came to a focus in Calvin's favorite Epistle, the Epistle to the Ephesians. In retrospect he writes, "To this book I owe my life. . . . Apart from the experience that came to me through the Bible and the vision that met me in the Epistle to the Ephesians, I am nothing, and my life has no meaning" (pp. 6, 8).

The lad who had the "quickening" experience in 1903 soon rose to positions of eminence in the life and work of the church, chiefly in Latin America and the United States. Since 1936 he has been serving as president of the Princeton Theological Seminary. In the volume under review he shares with the reading public the substance of the Croall Lectures which he delivered at the University of Edinburgh in 1948. One can understand why he elected to devote his lectures at Edinburgh to an exposition of his favorite Epistle. He saw in the occasion a happy opportunity to bear witness to the vitalizing influence of the Epistle on his life and thinking from the days of his "awakening" in the Highlands to the northward. One can also understand why his exposition is keyed throughout to the ecumenical overtones of the Epistle. His ears are tuned to such music.

The book is not a critical study. The author dismisses the problem of authorship with a footnote (p. 10) in which he casts his vote with Ernst Percy, who defends the authenticity of the Epistle (*Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe*, Lund, 1946), as over against C. Leslie Mitton, who decides against it (*The Epistle to the Ephesians, Its Authorship, Origin and Purpose,* Oxford, 1951).

Nor is the book a detailed, verse-by-verse analysis. It is a broad but incisive exposition of the dominating themes of the Epistle under the following headings: (1) Perspectives, (2) The Great Rift, (3) God's Unveiled Secret, (4) The Victory Which Christ Wrought, (5) New Men in Christ, (6) The New Divine Order, (7) The Fullness of Christ, (8) The Four Imperatives of Christian Living, and (9) Christian Action on the Frontiers of Strife. The book closes with an

Appendix in which the Epistle is reprinted in the text of the Revised Standard Version.

The book is the work of a man of faith. Scorning "the antiseptic air of objectivity," he endeavors to interpret the Epistle from the inside, as a revelation that changed all life for him. Occasionally the text serves as little more than a springboard for preachments which it has suggested to his alert mind, but he seldom strays far from the leading ideas of the Epistle or from the mind of Paul. Time and again, especially in the first half of the book, he pours out his soul in lyrical tributes to the Epistle, acclaiming it as the most important and most relevant New Testament witness to the Christian faith. Although these recurring rhapsodies and accolades tend to become mildly cloying, the sympathetic reader, far from taking exception to them, welcomes them as spontaneous outpourings of the author's enthusiasm for the Epistle.

The book is the work of a scholar. Now and then, when he is walking in areas that have become the private domain of the specialists, he loses his footing, but only momentarily. He accepts without question the traditional exegesis of Paul's remarkable phrase, *in the fullness of time* (Gal. 4:4), reading into it historical contingencies which most of us believe were far from Paul's thoughts, such as the *pax romana*, the popularity of *koine* Greek, and even the Roman roads! A more precise knowledge of Jewish messianic expectations in the first century might have given a slightly different slant to the passing reference to the Temptation of Jesus. The words "Be angry but do not sin" (Eph. 4:26) are interpreted without reference to their background in the Septuagint and the Hebrew Bible (cf. Psalm 4:5). The present reviewer agrees that there is no compelling warrant for the retention of the comma after the word *saints* in Eph. 4:12, ". . . for the equipment of the saints, for the work of the ministry," but are we not going rather far when we contend that the editors of the Revised Standard Version retained the comma "without linguistic authority but with undoubted ecclesiological bias" (p. 149)? On the whole, however, the book exhibits a high degree of competence even in technical details.

The book is the work of an ecclesiastical statesman whose urbanity is redeemed from a spineless cosmopolitanism by clear and solid thinking. At a few points his ecumenical enthusiasms get the better of him, as when he repeatedly characterizes the first readers of the Epistle as "ecumenical Christians." The writer of the Epistle was beyond all doubt an ecumenical genius, but the romantic inference that the original readers of the Epistle were like him in that respect is more intriguing than plausible. Indeed, just as loveless attitudes in the congregation at Corinth called forth Paul's immortal Ode to Love in I Cor. 13, so parochial attitudes in the communities addressed may have called forth the noble ecumenical emphasis in the encyclical known to us as the Epistle to the Ephesians. In its broad sweep, however, the author's exposition of the ecumenical ideal leaves little to be desired. He knows the contemporary scene. His strictures on Roman Catholicism are based upon his first-hand observations in Spain and various Latin American countries. He also knows the mind of Paul. Particularly noteworthy is his sturdy insistence that "the unity which God wills is a *religious unity*. A religious unity is a unity in which created spirits live in perfect harmony with the will of the Creator. . . . The real problem is to constitute a spiritual unity in which men, being united in their loyalty to God, shall be loyally devoted to one another. . . . Such unity is not an abstract unity. It is a community, a fellowship of human spirits who are united to God and to one another. . . . In this community love is designed to be regnant and the hierarchical principle, that of reverence for true superiority, is designed to be real" (pp. 62-62).

The book is the work of a man of letters. His style is a refreshing relief from the colorless and slipshod "prosiness" to which most of us have become both inured and addicted. Perhaps it is at times too elegant, too statuesque, too self-consciously

literary. Although it is happily free from the bombast and the purple passages that mark the literary effusions of John L. Lewis, it does not quite achieve the spontaneity, the chaste dignity, and the crystalline simplicity of the style that has made C. S. Lewis a universal favorite. The author is not, like Tolstoi, an implacable foe of rhetoric and virtuosity. He writes in the courtly tradition, as one who is not ashamed to take pains to write well. Readers who have grown weary of the current contempt for rhetoric in the field of theology will be grateful to the author for his distinguished rhetoric as well as for his penetrating insights. His book is welcome proof that theology need not be an unlettered Muse.

All in all, the book is the work of an informed mind, a talented pen, and a consecrated and enthusiastic heart. What more could we ask for?

RUSSELL D. SNYDER

Methodical Bible Study: A New Approach to Hermeneutics. By Robert A. Traina. New York, 1952. (Copies available through the bookstore of the Biblical Seminary in New York, 235 East 49th Street, New York 17.) 269 pages. $3.95.

This manual seeks to provide "some guideposts which point out the *methodos* to fruitful study of the Bible" (p. 231). Instead of working topically, as many hermeneutical volumes do, it provides a step-by-step treatment, applicable to any Scripture passage, concerned primarily with the English translation. This inductive method, outlined profusely and with many examples, consists of (1) Observation—to note the components of the passage; (2) Interpretation—to determine their meaning, to re-create "the attitudes, motives, thoughts, and emotions" of the writer through empathy and a "sanctified imagination" (pp. 93 f.); (3) Evaluation, and Application to contemporary situations; and (4) Correlation "into a vital Biblical theology . . . [and] Christian philosophy of life" (p. 223). Steps for Observation and Interpretation take up about half the book. An Appendix gives examples of charts, word study, and logical outlines, together with suggestions for use of the book in teaching, its intended purpose. It is worth noting that a simplified lay edition, which can have wider currency, is also being prepared.

Some emphases often neglected in biblical study here receive their due: psychological factors in authorship, for example; and literary structure, which may not even follow historical or chronological order. But the grammatico-historical approach remains basic for exposition. Generally the author's views are of a sane, "middle-of-the-road" nature, as, for example, his comment on apocalyptic literature: "explain [it] in terms of basic, universal, spiritual principles rather than . . . of a concrete historical timetable" (p. 149); and his ability to see the values and excesses in literalistic, mythological, and other types of interpretation.

The reviewer would raise two questions. First, since the methodical outlines sometimes seem too involved, is there not a danger of becoming bogged down amid "definitive term-al questions" and "interpretive implicational structural questions?" The author is aware of this when he warns that the method is a means, not an end, and that not all of it will have to be used at all times. Second, in many cases, might not time be better spent on the original, rather than on English translations? To clear up one point, the author has to fall back on a description of the Greek tense anyway (pp. 143 f.). Why not begin there? However, his remarks on vernacular vs. original show a common sense approach in a day of grammatical darkness (p. 145).

In the list of linguistic aids (p. 140), A. T. Roberston's *Word Pictures in the New Testament* might be listed along with Vincent's older *Word Studies,* as well as the series of volumes by Kenneth Wuest of Moody Bible Institute; they are written for those who know "little English and less Greek." Add, on a more scholarly level, Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch,* now happily beginning to appear in English as *Bible Key Words,* and reflected, in a lesser

way, by Richardson's *Theological Wordbook of the Bible*. In the discussion of Old and New Testament revelation, the classic Lutheran distinction between Law and Gospel might be helpful (pp. 156 ff.). And not all will agree with the Aristotelian-sounding phrase, "possible variations in the Bible are *accidental* rather than *substantial*" (p. 212, italics mine).

In summary, however, the reader will find here much in the way of stimulating suggestion and sound insight. Best of all, *Methodical Bible Study* will encourage him to ask constantly "why?"—something not always done in the past because Scripture was felt too sacred for criticism and analysis, and something not always done today because we are content with the pat answers of our own particular tradition, instead of wrestling with the text itself.

JOHN REUMANN

Concise Bible Commentary. By W. K. Lowther Clarke. New York: Macmillan Company, 1953. 996 pages. $7.00.

One-volume commentaries on the whole Bible have value for lay people and also, for quick reference, for clergymen. This commentary follows in the succession of Dummelow and Gore, but it is distinguished from these by four features: In the first place, the whole book is written by one man, the former editorial secretary of the Anglican Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, and this gives the work a large measure of internal unity and uniformity. In the second place, as much as one-third of the volume is made up of introductory articles, in themselves of great value, but this leaves comparatively little space for the interpretation of individual passages of the Bible. In the third place, a brief commentary on the Old Testament apocrypha is included, and this should be appreciated by users of the work. In the fourth place, a brief glossary of biblical terms, from abba to zealot, is appended. A substantial help to Bible readers is here afforded.

Frikyrklighetens Uppkomst. By Arvid Norberg. Stockholm, 1953. 248 pages.

A little over a century ago the "Old Sweden" began to change. Industrialization began to shift the population which had been overwhelmingly rural to urban centers. Railroads opened communication to areas formerly isolated. New ideas in agriculture affected methods of farming. Drastic redistribution of land holdings did away with strip farming and consolidated land holdings. Farm workers and city dwellers learned the meaning of unemployment. An ancient collectivist society gave way to a more highly individualized existence. Associations took on some of the obligations formerly inherent in a static society.

All of this is in the background of the present volume, which seeks to explain the origin of the free church movement in Sweden. Norberg is aware of the relevance of these factors. But he is not very successful in explaining why they necessarily led to a breakup of the national church. We are forced to the conclusion that this church could not adjust itself to changing conditions—or would not—and looked with disfavor on any changes in its own century-old methods.

It is true that Methodism and the Baptist movement made inroads on the church of Sweden. But it is also true that many of the laymen who desired a deeper spiritual life were friendly to the church, and Evangeliska-Fosterlandsstiftelsen wanted to be a force *within* the church. But with noteworthy exceptions—Bishop Beckman, for example—the national church looked with suspicion on lay activity and preferred the undisturbed peace of former days. Even the author in his attempt to be fair to the free-church movement betrays his sympathy for the old order, and permits himself the nostalgic comment, "If religious unity could have been preserved, our people would doubtless be a much more Christian people than it now is" (186).

But the church could not remain unchanged in a changing world without suffering great loss. This work has particular reference to one diocese, Skara, and traces in considerable

detail, though with needless repetition, how remnants of Old Lutheran piety combined with Moravian and Anglo-American influences to form a religious movement which finally broke free from the state church. Disregarding an antiquated conventicle act, expressing itself first in small groups for Bible study and preaching, then going on into societies for communion and even baptism, the dissenters finally, under Waldenstrom, organized an independent church.

It is a valuable document, throwing light on the Lutheran doctrine of the church, especially the doctrine of the ministry. It should cause Lutherans to ponder more seriously the question if the time has not come to restudy these doctrines in the light of the twentieth century. A church as well as an individual may so love its privileges that it loses its life.

CONRAD BERGENDOFF

Internationale Zeitschriftenschau für Bibelwissenschaft und Grenzgebiete. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1951/52, Heft 1. 196 pages. $3.50.

This international review of biblical and related studies should be in every Seminary library and will be of great importance to every biblical scholar. Edited by a joint commission of Catholic and Evangelical scholars at Tübingen, it aims to list all biblical articles in periodical literature. Numbers are projected for each half-year. A large proportion of the articles is briefly and objectively summarized, mostly in German, but occasionally by an editor employing English, French, or Latin.

In the initial number, a total of 393 journals are ransacked; more are promised in future. The arrangement tentatively adopted ranges from Bible texts and versions in general through interpretations of single books and passages of the entire Bible, and on to subjects like the ancient church, the Bible in liturgy and preaching and in the history of literature and art. The coverage is amazing. Future numbers will be indexed and of immense assistance to researchers.

CHARLES M. COOPER

Verkündigung und Forschung. Theologischer Jahresbericht. Edited by E. Wolf et al. München: Christian Kaiser, 1947—. Three numbers published annually at DM 6.60 by subscription. Single number, DM 2.20.

Since the close of World War II this useful review of current theological literature, especially but by no means exclusively in German, has been published to provide a general orientation in developments which are taking place in the several branches of theological study. The literature discussed is not only digested but it is also evaluated critically. To illustrate the type of material treated, Numbers 1-2 for the year 1953 contain extended discussions of Bultmann's demythologization (by H. Braun), of Swedish studies in the New Testament (by K. Stendahl), of Brunner's theology (by G. Gloege), of the doctrine of the church and the ecumenical movement (by W. Schweitzer), of H. Richard Niebuhr's contributions to American theology (by H. H. Wolf), of Eastern Orthodoxy (by H. Schaeder), and of studies in Reformation history (by E. Wolf). In some numbers there are also checklists of periodical articles.

THEODORE G. TAPPERT

Early Christian Fathers. Edited by Cyril C. Richardson. (The Library of Christian Classics, Volume I.) Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953. 416 pages. $5.

Volume I of the planned "Library of Christian Classics" meets a need and is a job well done. Richardson and his fellow translators have rendered the text into a correct, readable, and interesting modern language. The correctness is important. Goodspeed, in his fascinating edition of the Apostolic Fathers in 1950, sacrificed exactness to modernity. Instead of "eucharist" he said "thanksgiving" and instead of "bishops" and "deacons" he wrote "overseers" and "assistants" to the despair of those for whom the literal reading has significance. But exactness must be supplemented by readability, if the book is to have circulation. In the Loeb series Kir-

sop Lake has given us the necessary "pony" for those who work with the original text. Richardson's translation reads well, and for those who have struggled with the ponderousness and the murderous small print of the Ante-Nicene volumes the book is a comfort and a pleasure.

The selection is good. There is no reason why the ancient formula of "Apostolic Fathers" should limit a volume, to the omission of the Apologists. It is much better, as has been done here, to make the second century the framework of a selection. In the present volume Justin and Athanagoras are included. Of particular importance is the fact that Irenaeus is taken along. He is looming up more and more as a key figure in the understanding of early church development. The fragments of Papias could well have been included, but it is enough to notice that Barnabas and The Shepherd, from the classical list of Apostolic Fathers, are omitted.

The indexes are excellent and the introductions to each document are very complete and informative. So are the bibliographies. It is regrettable, however, that Richardson perpetuates the old fallacy that Titus Flavius Clemens might have been a Christian in connection with his discussion of the authorship of I Clement. The general introduction forms a brief and precise history of the early days of the church, but it seems almost too categorical in its discussion of developments. The second century situation was more fluid than the impression which is given, especially the build-up given to the monarchical bishop is too rigid.

The book is a must for all libraries and it is greatly to be recommended to all who are interested in the history of the church.

J. KNUDSEN

History of the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States, 1825-1934, Evangelical and Reformed Church 1934-1952. By George Warren Richards, Lancaster, Pa., 1952. xiii, 660 pages. $5.00.

No one could be better qualified to write the history of the Lancaster Seminary than Dr. Richards. His personal association with the institution, as student and alumnus, as professor for forty years and president for nineteen, covers more than half of the long period he portrays in this volume. His prominence in his own denomination, as pastor and church president and as the author of official documents, gives him unusual insight into the total sweep of events in the oldest and largest seminary of that denomination. His intimate association with general Christian movements in this country and all over the world during the past half century provides a good framework in which to portray the life of this influential institution. And the reputation of his facile pen for accuracy and clarity guarantees a trustworthy and readable narrative.

The book is divided into four parts. In the first part (chapters I-VII) the beginnings of the German Reformed Church in the United States in America are set forth. For a hundred years the Church obtained its ministers chiefly from the mother-church in Germany. Only a few came from among the Huguenots in France and the Reformed in Holland. The congregations in America insisted upon it that their ministers, from whatever source they came, must be "educated and pious." The outstanding names in this period are John Philip Boehm and Michael Schlatter. The coming of Schlatter and the organization of the Coetus in 1747 led to proposals for a theological seminary in America.

The second part (chapters VIII-XI) covers "The Synodal Period, 1817-1824." The Synod of the German Reformed Church began in 1793. The need for a native-born and trained ministry now became increasingly clear. The Reformed people were spreading to the inland. The number of congregations was increasing. Social and intellectual conditions were changing so much that it was difficult for ministers born in Europe to serve American congregations. Fifteen denominational seminaries were founded in this period, including two by the Lutherans, one at Hartwick (1797) and one at Gettysburg (1826). The Seminary of the German Reformed Church was established in

1826, after many difficulties and much controversy within the Church.

The third part (chapters XII-XXIX) covers the major portion of the book. It traces the main course of events in the life of the Seminary, at Carlisle (1825-1829), at York (1829-1837), at Mercersburg (1837-1871), and at Lancaster (1871-1952). The chief emphasis is on the teachers and teaching at Mercersburg, and that period of twenty-four years in the life of the Seminary requires 156 pages as compared with the 132 pages required for the aggregate of ninety-three years at Carlisle, York, and Lancaster. In connection with part three there are chapters on the history of the Seminary library, the government of the institution, and its extra-curricular activities.

Of special value is part four (chapters XXX-XXXIV). They interpret the "spirit and purpose of the Seminary" through all the years. The missionary motive in the founding and early development of the institution is set forth in detail. It was the constant effort of the leaders in moulding the curriculum and selecting the staff to combine "true piety" and "sound learning" as the two essential elements in an effective Christian ministry. The Lancaster Seminary reflected the changing currents of the American theological scene, not least of all in the importation from Germany of Ritschlianism and the Higher Criticism at the beginning of the twentieth century.

Part five contains biographies of eighteen professors of the Seminary who are no longer living, from Mayer to Harner. There are also comprehensive indices, both of persons and of places and subjects, and an extended bibliography of published and unpublished materials on the history of the Seminary.

The reader of this comprehensive history of the Seminary will be impressed with the breadth of the research achieved by the author, and with the close relation between the life of the Seminary and the life of the German Reformed Church. Lutheran readers will readily discover the parallel between the course of the Seminary now at Lancaster and that of its near neighbor at Gettysburg, only one year younger. The agitation of the Mercersburg period had its counterpart in the Lutheran Church. In both churches the younger generation led the way in the repristination of conservative theological positions at the middle of the nineteenth century. Dr. Richards has done well to present the Mercersburg period with so much detail. It was a symptom of the times and a decisive factor in the life of the Reformed Church. To this reviewer it seems to be of special value to have such a careful and clear analysis of John W. Nevin and his theological positions, and of Philip Schaff and his teaching at Mercersburg. For the student of general church history, this is the most rewarding part of the volume.

Dr. Richards remarks that the Seminary at Lancaster "has played a large part in the conciliatory movements for closer relations of the churches in the United States and in the international councils." It may be added that this has been chiefly due to the irenical and scholarly influence of President Richards himself. Without asking any seminary or church to surrender a single iota of its history or a single item in its Christian heritage, he has called for meditation, adaptation and cooperation. "Mutual adaptation must come about, not by ecclesiastical diplomacy, not by the bartering of doctrines and ways of life, but by growth in the knowledge and love of God and his Son, Jesus Christ." In his story of the Seminary Dr. Richards shows that "Transition was made gradually from the polemical to the irenical attitude, from the irenical to the ecumenical spirit of the church of the living God, one holy apostolic catholic church, with diversity of functions and loyalty to the Lord." This is the story also of many another seminary which has lived through that middle period of the nineteenth century.

A. R. Wentz

Report from Christian Europe. By Stewart Winfield Herman. New York: Friendship Press, 1953. 211 pages. $2.50.

During the last generation Adolf Keller, of Switzerland, supplied us with several

books in which he attempted to interpret European Christianity in the crises preceding World War II. Now Stewart Herman has done a similar job for us in terms of what has been happening since World War II, and in many respects this report is at once more comprehensive and more incisive despite the compact size of the book. Protestantism, Roman Catholicism, and Eastern Orthodoxy are presented with an analysis of their respective strength and vitality in various parts of Europe. Because of their interrelationships, political and economic as well as religious problems in the several countries are discussed. Churchmen like Dibelius and Niemöller, Berggrav and Munk, Hromadka and the pope, Temple and MacLeod move in and out of the story as prominent participants, but the rank and file in European churches are always very much in the forefront.

The author effectively marshals the knowledge he has acquired during almost two decades of life, work, travel, and observation in Europe. He is neither a sentimental optimist nor a hopeless pessimist in his estimate of the colossal difficulties which confront European Christianity, and what is especially important, he understands how the fate of Europe is related to the destiny of the rest of the world. And so his book is not only informative but also disturbing to the conscience of American Christianity.

Dr. Herman was recently appointed executive secretary of the Lutheran World Federation's Committee on Latin America, and it is to be hoped that he will in time give us a similar report on Christianity in the new scene of his activity.

THEODORE G. TAPPERT

The Great Quest. By Adolph Haentzschel. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1953. 121 pages.

This little book is an attempt to help answer two important and persistent questions of every age and generation, of young and old: What is true value? Where do I turn for basic insight into the meaning of the world and my own place in it?

The author, professor of philosophy at Valparaiso University, traces this quest as it has been carried on in the fields of religion, philosophy and science. With knowledge and sympathy he describes the endeavors in each to answer these basic questions of human existence. However, they all have stopped short of giving the answer which alone can satisfy the human heart. Their definitions of value leave the inquirer with the feeling that what they are talking about is something less than ultimate. They fail to instill confidence because, valuable as their insights may be, their authority is but relative. Sense experience, reason, intuition are after all not able to say the final word.

If these fields of research fail to give the answer we seek in this quest, where shall we turn? Dr. Haentzschel answers that question in two parts. First he refers, in Kantian fashion, to the moral imperative called conscience. In conscience, he maintains, we have a clear testimony that God is and that man stands in a responsible relation to him. His discussion of conscience at this point is very good, but it may perhaps be asked whether the witness of conscience might not have some of the same limitations as the other "authorities" which he has dismissed earlier as unreliable. His clinching answer to the question—and this is the really fine part of the book—is that only if and when the inquirer commits himself to God in faith and obedience will he be truly assured of the existence of God and of what his own place in the scheme of things is according to God's intention.

Dr. Haentzschel obviously is not thinking primarily of the scholar, but the lay inquirer. Probably he is thinking very particularly of college students, many of whom are among the most earnest in this great quest, and who will almost surely be attracted not only by the author's style, but also by his sympathetic understanding.

THEO. I. JENSEN

Expository Preaching for Today. By Andrew W. Blackwood. New York: Abingdon Cokesbury. 207 pages, 1953. $3.00.

The author of this volume has made a

significant contribution through the years to the cause of a wider use of Scripture in preaching. First in Princeton Seminary, now in the School of Theology in Temple University, he has influenced generations of young preachers. He has also extended his influence by prolific writing.

This latest volume *Expository Preaching for Today* gathers and concentrates much of the material of previous volumes. Perhaps in style and suggestions it tends to be somewhat repetitive. One finds more than an echo, for example, of the earlier Blackwood in *Preaching From the Bible*. In the present volume this material is focused more specifically upon the expository technique. In some sections the material seems to be forcibly bent to fit into the author's chosen theme.

The heart of this work is in the "case studies" in which the author presents examples of expository homiletical treatment of selected passages. Dr. Blackwood has long been a master of the art of good, valid, interesting exposition. Here he commends the practice of expository preaching, answering the strongest objection to it, by the quality of the outlines he presents. If the preacher will use these examples to stir his own imagination, and not as crutches, he will find much benefit from the study of this book.

Expository preaching is defined as meaning "that the light for any sermon comes mainly from a Bible passage longer than two or three consecutive verses. This kind of message differs from a textual sermon chiefly in the length of the Bible passage." The author continues, "In any case the wise interpreter begins with a human need and chooses a passage that will enable him to meet this need."

At this point of definition the reviewer differs from his valued counselor. In true expository preaching the emphasis ought not be upon the length of the passage but upon the "ex-pono"—upon the faithful setting forth, the interpretation, and the application of the passage. The distinguishing mark ought not be the length of the passage. Nor should the preacher begin with a human need and then find a passage to fit that need. He should begin with the Word of God and allow it to lead him to its own intended mark. This will unquestionably bring him to the very place of human need and the Scripture will have a fitting application. But the truly expository preacher will begin with the Scripture. He will find the experience to which the passage speaks in the experience that produced the Scripture, and will apply that to the living need.

After defining expository preaching, noting briefly the methods of some expository preachers, and stressing the need and the reasons for more of this kind of preaching, Dr. Blackwood launches into the heart of subject. He presents his "case studies." As usual he impresses the reader with two great qualities, his insight into the Scripture and his own rich, personal religious devotion. This work bears the marks of a wide experience, a knowledge of life, an understanding of human nature and its needs, and a fine religious faith and fervor. The art of illustration is well employed and the truths discerned in God's Word are faithfully applied.

This volume performs a real service in that it points to a much needed pulpit method. It adds a distinguished voice to the call for a greater knowledge and use of the Bible. It offers helpful techniques to the preacher. It can help to replenish the reservoir of preaching material and inspiration. It carries however the peril present in all such works, that of putting ready made outlines into hands too frequently waiting for such easily won materials.

HARRY F. BAUGHMAN

Heralds of the Gospel. By H. T. Lehmann. Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press. 76 pages. $1.25.

This little book concerned with "The Implications of the New Testament Proclamation for the Sermon of Today" from the pen of the new Dean of the Evangelical Lutheran Seminary of Canada, Waterloo, Canada, is a fresh approach to an old assignment in the church: preaching. The

introduction concerns itself with the meanings of the Greek words of the New Testament which cover that concept. The first chapter centers on the herald and his proclamation.

In the second chapter the author plunges into a discussion of "The Word of God and the Word of Man in the Christian Proclamation" and fails, I fear, to bring the reader up out of those depths with a clear understanding of purpose or conclusions. There is a positive rejection of "a fundamentalistic or semi-fundamentalistic view of the Bible." There seems to be rejection of certain positions represented in the words of two highly regarded teachers of homiletics: "The sermon is nothing else than the offer and proclamation of the Word." "Preach the Word of God, that is, something definite out of the Word of God." Just what the full implications of the author's statement on page 16 will be is uncertain: "This 'biblical Docetism' finds its expression in the pulpit quite often in an attitude described as *securitas*. Such false security grows out of a naive identification of the Word of God and the words of man, not only in the Bible but in the pulpit."

If we are not permitted to identify the Word of God and the words of men in the Bible, why the author's flaming emphasis on the biblical languages as on pp. 45 and 46: "To work with God's Word and to let God's Word work on the preacher necessitates the use of the original languages in which that Word has been handed down to us."

Granted that the issues discussed in Chapter II need to be kept clear, we much prefer the approach in the "Declaration" adopted by the Baltimore Convention of the United Lutheran Church in America, 1938, which carries in the seventh paragraph the following summary: "The Scriptures are God's testimony to his Son, who is their center. They are God's Word, the means through which God leads us to faith in Christ, and in our faith we see their testimony as God's own. Thus we know that they come from him, are inspired by him, and are God's Word."

We trust that Dean Lehmann will not be so occupied with administrative duties as to be hindered from further authorship. I am sure his publications will be welcomed.

T. F. Gullixson

Lives that Glorify God. Daily Biographical Meditations. By Amos Lundquist. Rock Island: Augustana Book Concern, 1953. 374 pages. $2.50.

The daily devotions here offered are rather unique in that they revolve about prominent persons of the past and present. Following an apt "memory verse" from the Bible, something that is characteristic of the individual chosen is related, a brief sketch of his life is offered, and a prayer (sometimes by the person treated) is appended. Each meditation is a page in length and is headed by dates from January 1 to December 31. There is an index of names. The author has produced a helpful and different manual for private and domestic devotions.

The Beauty of Holiness. By J. Baines Atkinson. New York: Philosophical Library, 1953. 160 pages. $2.75.

This is more of a testimony than a treatise. In it a devout British Methodist tells of his convictions. His years of Bible study, preaching, and teaching have confirmed him in his views of sanctification. And he finds himself in accord with what John Wesley wrote.

He did not need to step outside Methodist bounds to discuss various aspects of holiness, for within Wesleyanism there have been varying views on the subject. Hence he made no effort to state the conclusions of other theologies beyond a few unsympathetic comments about Calvinism. His interest is not in the history of the doctrine.

Candidates for Methodist ordination are still asked, "Are you going on to perfection?" Holiness, sanctification, perfection have been prominent in the author's thinking for many years. He has become something of a specialist on the subject. Sanctification, he feels, needs continued stress among Methodists, to say nothing of other Christians who historically have given the topic minor attention.

His method is largely that of a topical

concordance. Many of the illustrations are trite. There is no index. Yet there is a fervent simplicity that is winsome. And his ninth chapter on "The Fruits of Perfect Love" is a gem. The entire book is a gentle rebuke to Christian complacency. Especially is it a study of Wesley's views.

Lutherans, accustomed to *simul justus et peccator,* will enter an objection here or there. Historically perfectionism has been a characteristic of schismatics. Yet there is an evangelical holiness which is legitimate and which this little book justly calls to our attention.

W. D. Allbeck

The Art of Effective Teaching. By C. B. Eavey. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing Company, 1953. 298 pages. $3.75.

This is a long step toward the kind of book we have been needing. The Betts and Hawthorne volume, *Method in Teaching Religion,* was published in 1925 and has been outmoded for at least a dozen years. In particular the developmental approach has come to the fore since that date, with such forms of practice as unit procedure.

This is not as complete a treatment; there are only 298 pages instead of 488, and it lacks the equivalent of Betts and Hawthorne's Part II, Applications to Classroom Procedure. Yet it does set forth the meaning of developmental teaching in a practical manner with abundant suggestions as to its use. A few chapter titles will exemplify the approach: Arranging Conditions for Effective Learning; Guiding the Individual; Living and Learning with Pupils.

Among the most practical of the author's contributions is an excellent section on unit management. He is to be commended also for balancing the psychological emphasis in educational theory with some of the implications of sociological findings. He had the courage, too, to enter the non-man's land of motivation.

One wonders about the readers for whom Doctor Eavey is writing and concludes that college and seminary students can read the book profitably although it does not have the appearance and apparatus of a textbook. It would fit nicely into the Third Series courses of the Standard Leadership Curriculum. Perhaps it will be best for pastors who want to understand what is, or should be, going on in their church schools and, after reading it, will hand it to their more advanced workers.

All in all, Doctor Eavey has realized his announced aim: ". . . to present for use in Christian teaching what modern education acknowledges in general to be superior."

R. D. Heim

The Chorale Through Four Hundred Years of Musical Development as a Congregational Hymn. By Edwin Liemohn. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1935. 170 pages. $2.50.

The Lutheran chorale is gaining ground in America. The current renaissance of pre-Bach organ music has aroused general interest in the sturdy chorale tunes which inspired the Baroque organ masters. And numerous reprints testify to the popularity of chorale harmonizations by Bach, Praetorius, Eccard, and many other precentors of the early Lutheran Church. A brief history of the Chorale has been wanting for a long time.

German and Scandinavian scholars have, indeed, covered this subject quite exhaustively. But the volume under review is the first attempt to treat it more extensively in English. Dr. Liemohn traces the development of the chorale from the beginnings to the present and reserves a closing chapter to some of the problems which beset modern hymn book editors. He brings to this task a firm grasp of the subject and a wide knowledge of its literature, especially with regard to the Scandinavian chorale. His presentation is marked by fluent style and a very clear arrangement of the material. The generous number of musical examples in the text are to the credit both of the author and the publisher.

Dr. Liemohn devised an original plan for his presentation. In order to illustrate the successive changes of musical style, he uses

two chorales of Luther: *Ein feste Burg* and *Vom Himmel hoch,* and traces their melodic and harmonic variations in the hymn books of different times and climes. This is practical in one way. It allows for ready comparison. But in another way, it greatly narrows the scope of this work. For it focuses the author's attention on the differing principles of editing chorales, rather than on the original, creative work done in each period. One might say, the book tends at times to become a history of "chorale books," rather than of chorales. After all, each generation and nation gave their best, not in editing Luther's chorales, but in inventing new tunes in accord with their own style and feeling. These new melodies might have received somewhat more attention. With an approach of this nature, the connection between the general musical development and the history of the chorale might also have been shown more clearly.

But as the first book on a subject which is both important and interesting, this volume deserves to be recommended heartily. It offers a valuable introduction into the history of the chorale and will serve as a useful book of reference for pastors, church musicians, and all others who would like to know more about the finest of Christian hymns: the Lutheran Chorales.

ULRICH S. LEUPOLD

The Choirmaster's Workbook, Volume 3. Dayton W. Nordin, Editor. Rock Island, Illinois: Augustana Book Concern, 1952. Plastic ring binding, about 225 pages. $2.50.

This long, slim volume, made to fit into one's outside coat pocket, will prove practically indispensable to the organist and choirmaster. Its basic popularity is shown by the fact that this is Volume 3 of the same title. A mere paging through the book will suggest the reasons for its popularity: 1. There is much information and inspiration to be found between the covers. 2. When the blanks in the dated pages have been filled out, one will have a faithful record of rehearsal and performance for three years.

The book opens with several very fine articles, on appropriate organ music (with generous listing of good selections), on choir problems and their solution, on children's choir work, on good pronunciation, etc., plus an excellent listing of choir music for the Sundays of the church year. An index of one's local library of anthems (to be filled in) is another feature. And at the close a choir attendance record keeps the human score.

The bulk of the book consists of work and record sheets for every Sunday and special occasion of the church year. These pages will show at a glance what has been sung on each Sunday for the three years of this record, how well it was correlated with the propers for the Sunday, and what organ music was used. The Sunday pages are interleaved with rehearsal record pages listing the work done at rehearsal and showing what is being planned for the next several Sundays. Interesting "shorts" and suggestive notes here and there complete the book.

Volume 3 is supposed to run from 1952 through 1954. It could easily be adapted to run longer. Altogether this is about the most useful and inspiring small volume for the choirmaster and organist which has thus far come to the attention of the reviewer. Your church musicians will appreciate receiving a copy.

ALBERT A. JAGNOW

The Funeral Encyclopedia. Edited by Charles L. Wallis. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953. 327 pages. $3.95.

Professor Wallis of Keuka College has compiled a book which is inclusive and well arranged: I. The Funeral Service; II. A Treasury of Funeral Sermons; III. An Anthology of Funeral Poems; IV. A Sheaf of Funeral Prayers; V. Professional Conduct. It has six indexes: Sources, Names of Contributors, Poetry Index, Textual Index, Classification Index, and Topical Index. It is a satisfying volume to handle and to work with. It gains warmth through the use of the Authorized Version in almost every instance of Scripture quotation. And it gains acceptability through its relatively low cost.

The book reflects a fine sensitivity throughout—not only in the choice of materials but in the practical counsel given—for example, with reference to the use and reading of poems and regarding details of professional conduct. Those who possess and use established and liturgical forms will find the orders here provided the least significant portion of the book, even though carefully assembled. The sermons (91) are in many instances models of brevity and pointed Christian witness, are from three to six minutes in length, and represent some "greats" of the pulpit, past and present, as well as many others. Of the General Poems and the Prayer Poems, totaling 115, the reviewer found some 41 familiar.

Two disturbing matters may be mentioned. The one is the lack of a clear distinction, in a number of instances, between benedictions and prayers. The other is a tolerance of joint services with fraternal organizations unexpected in one whose general emphasis is in behalf of a clear Christian witness. It may be noted that it seems to have been planned originally to include a portion on "The Fraternal Service" and another on "The Military Service" (cf. the outline on the back page of the jacket), but both were happily omitted in the final publishing. For the latter, reference is made to a War Department Bulletin available on request, and that should suffice.

HENRY H. BAGGER

20 *Funeral Sermons.* By Pastors of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1952. 202 pages. $3.00.

It is claimed for these twenty sermons, divided into nine typical groups (Sudden Death, Death in Youth, etc.), that they have all been preached. Nor is it to be doubted that they have given instruction, comfort, and strength. At the same time I cannot help but wonder whether their helpfulness has not been more because of the attendant circumstances, because they are scripturally rooted and grounded, and because they have come from the lips of faithful pastors known and loved by their parishioners, than because of any inherent comeliness or form. In short, they seem to be considerably longer than is acceptable in most areas today and are, with some exceptions, heavy in structure, overly catechetical, and excessively somber in spirit. All too often, in avoiding the personal and subjective, they are bare and hard, nor are they other than in a few instances illumined by carefully selected illustrations. Though setting forth the truth, they seem somehow to fall short of making that truth glow. They may be studied with profit, but in part in order to see whether something cannot be found that is somewhere between them and the loosely scriptural and mawkishly sentimental.

Of special interest and very likely destined to be the most used part of the book is the supplement containing 405 selected texts for funeral sermons drawn from Paul W. Nesper's well-known *Biblical Texts* (Wartburg Press, Columbus, Ohio).

HENRY H. BAGGER

These Things Remain. By Carlyle Marney. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1952. $2.00.

Ten sermons in this volume by the young pastor of the First Baptist Church of Austin, Texas, indicate that a new, fresh voice has come into the American pulpit. The unconventional format is reminiscent of Peter Marshall. The racy and rushing style often spills over into poetic forms. The effect is a sense of urgency on the part of a preacher who has unusual imaginative gifts. Although for the most part unmistakably evangelical in content, these sermons show greater facility in diagnosing the human situation—which is often brilliantly done—than in bringing the Gospel alive. It is also regrettable that the prime virtues of simplicity and clarity are sacrificed at the expense of unconventionality in style. Yet this volume of sermons is well worth looking into, for there is urgency here, and flashes of power and insight lacking in most of the more conventional sermons of our time.

EDMUND A. STEIMLE

A House for Tomorrow. By Reuben K. Youngdahl. Rock Island: Augustana Book Concern, 1952. $2.00.

The startling growth of Mount Olivet Lutheran Church in Minneapolis, one of *The Christian Century's* "Twelve Great Churches," provokes more than ordinary interest in this first volume of sermons published by its pastor. Disappointing if one is looking for unusual depth or brilliance, these twenty brief sermons may provide a clue to the type of preaching today which is broadly popular. The sermons are topical. A text is indicated in each case, but the text is rarely developed. Rather, a topic suggested by the text is developed in very simple terms with abundant use of anecdotal illustrations. The predominant note is an appeal for a decision as indicated by these typical subjects: "Who is on the Lord's Side?" "Do You Show Your Colors?" The sermons deal with the individual in his everyday life but reflect little of the individual's relationship to the larger concerns of our time.

EDMUND A. STEIMLE

Young China in the Valley of Decision. By Palmer I. Anderson. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1953. 123 pages. $1.00.

Much has been written about Communist China, and the place of the church in the Chinese Communist scheme of things. After all of it has been said, however, many people in the West are still confused about the situation there, due partially to the conflicting conclusions expressed, and also to the rather tenuous and theoretical nature of much of the information.

Palmer I. Anderson, a missionary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church to China since 1921, and even now serving as teacher in the Lutheran Bible School at Hong Kong, has given us in this modest and simple little book new insight into the problem faced by the Christian church in a communist society. Here is no speculative, philosophical discussion of the church and Communism—here, rather, is the *Sitz im Leben* of the most pressing contemporary problem.

Mr. Anderson presents a gallery of Chinese young people, all of whom have met head-on the demand for decision: the church or the Communist state? The answer is not always the same—some choose Christ, but others choose Mao tse Tung. Thus it is a gladdening, yet a saddening story.

The values and the possible uses of the book are varied. For the preacher it can provide a wealth of illustrative material, as well as insight into a social problem. For young people's groups and missionary study classes it may be used as a resource book. For the general reader *Young China* will reveal the power of the redeeming Christ in the believing heart as we face the corruption of militant evil.

FRANCIS E. REINBERGER

The Sage and the Olive. By Florence Whitfield Barton. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1953. 266 pages. $3.75.

This is the life story of Robert Estienne, cast in the form of a historical novel. He is perhaps better known by the Latinized form of his name, Stephanus. In the field of Bible printing and publishing, Robert Estienne stands out as one of the most prominent Frenchmen of the sixteenth century. (It was he who introduced the division of chapters into verses and numbering these for easier reference.) Influenced by reform movements in early youth, he devoted his lifetime to the printing and publishing of scholarly editions of the Holy Scriptures in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, as a fundamental aid to the reformation of the church. The repeated conflicts with the powerful and reactionary Sorbonne of the University of Paris constitute some of the most fascinating chapters of the book. Relentlessly pursued by these "arbiters of the mind of France," he was finally driven into exile. He went to Geneva, where in close association with John Calvin he continued his scholarly labors until his death in 1559.

The book is well written in a lively, smooth-flowing style. The leading characters

are sharply delineated and the various scenes are pictured with fine imagination. To anyone interested in the broader aspects of the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century we recommend this book for serious reading.

P. H. BUEHRING

Revised Version or Revised Bible? By Oswald T. Allis. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1953. 60 pages.

This brochure is "a critique of the *Revised Standard Version* of the Old Testament (1952)," written by the well-known fundamentalist scholar who for decades has been directing invectives against the critics (see, e.g., his *The Five Books of Moses,* 1943). Thoroughly trained in the languages and background of the Bible—he received his Ph.D. in Semitics at the University of Berlin in 1913—he is in position to examine the new version very critically. And this he does, largely from a negative point of view.

In his preface the author sets forth three reasons why the RSV has become a controversial issue. In the first place, the publishers and the National Council of Churches have given it "dangerous and ominous" pressure publicity. Secondly, while it purports to be only a *revision* of the Authorized Version of 1611, it makes "drastic changes in the diction and style." Thirdly, it is not merely a "modern speech" but a "modernist" or "higher critical" revision. For these reasons he feels that its defects should not be passed over in silence but given sharp criticism. Accordingly, he proceeds to find fault with its text, footnotes, inadequate marginal notes, inconsistencies, dogmatism, theological bias, unwarranted paraphrasing, cumbersome quotation marks, and numerous other characteristics which disprove its claim to be "a faithful rendering of the original."

Turning to the text, Dr. Allis seeks to show that contrary to the purposes of the Authorized Version of 1611 and the American Revised Version of 1901, which sought to hold steadfastly to the "Hebrew verity" of the original, the RSV departs from the basic text in the interest of an "idiomatic" and "intelligible" rendering. While the framers of AV employed italics to render the thought accurately, RSV uses no italics, yet is far less accurate. It alters sentences, omits words and phrases, and refers constantly to the "ancient versions" to correct the original. Hence it represents "a radical departure from the standard set by AV and ARV," which he regards as basically accurate translations.

In his study of the text and footnotes of RSV he observes that the revisers have introduced into the latter several confusing notations, which he cites and criticizes. He notes on the basis of several passages (e.g., Gen. 1:1; 9:26; Ps. 51:17; 68:4; 73:1) that *"Or . . ."* is "loosely and misleadingly used" (p. 8); that the use of *"Heb. . ."* "serves to inform the reader briefly and bluntly that RSV *prefers* another rendering or reading to that given by the Hebrew text" (p. 10); that in employing *"Heb obscure,"* RSV "sometimes raises difficulties where it is unnecessary and charges the Hebrew with obscurity or uncertainty without any sufficient warrant;" that by the use of *"Heb lacks"* the revisers make a one-sided and misleading appeal to the versions, especially the Greek; and that *"Cn:Heb. ."* refers to corrections introduced on the judgment of competent scholars, but which are merely "conjectural emendations" or "mere guesses." (See p. 23 f.)

In his pointed criticisms Dr. Allis warns Evangelical Christians to be on their guard against false conclusions reached by the presence on the Revision Committee of Dr. Harry Orlinsky, the Jewish scholar, and against a Pan-Canaanitism, to which even so conservative a scholar as Dr. W. F. Albright of Johns Hopkins contributes. By analyzing various passages he seeks to prove "that RSV shows its low esteem for the 'Hebrew verity'" (p. 29).

Comparing RSV with ARV as to marginal notes, he observes that the former has relatively few and even these fail to meet the test of fairness and clarity. "Sometimes," he affirms, "the marginal notes are so

worded as to give the reader the impression that the meaning of the Hebrew is so impossible that the text must be corrupt and require 'reconstruction'" (p. 33). But in further criticism he declares that "the most serious of the changes which RSV makes in the biblical text are those which it leaves entirely unindicated and unexplained . . ." (p. 35). Again, he finds that there are conflicts between the Old Testament and the New Testament in RSV and points out several inconsistencies. In its dogmatism and theological bias, he declares, "RSV prefers to have the Old Testament and New Testament conflict, rather than to admit that Ps. 45 is Messianic . . ." (p. 44). By modernizing the style of the Bible, particularly in changes from "thou" to "you," RSV further minimizes the messianic element. Its paraphrasing likewise does violence to the text. Similarly, the use of quotation marks, often bunched together, "is very confusing and arbitrary" (p. 57). Even in versification there are disturbing innovations and the "attempt to 'metricize' the prophets has been carried to a ridiculous extreme" (p. 60). By citing several passages the author seeks to illustrate each point in which RSV has introduced confusion.

In some instances, to be sure, his points are well taken and will need to be given careful consideration in any further revision of the text. In general, however, his criticisms are one-sided. He fails to emphasize any areas in which RSV shows marked superiority over AV and ARV, which he considers closer to the original.

E. E. Flack

Studien zum neutestamentlichen Schöpfungsgedanken, I. By Gösta Lindeskog. Uppsala, 1952. 302 pages.

The author is a prolific writer, docent in the New Testament at Uppsala University, and for several years editor of *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* (Swedish Exegetical Yearbook). His doctor's dissertation, *Die Jesusfrage im neuzeitlichen Judentum,* Uppsala, 1938, has been accepted as a valuable contribution to the research into the life of Jesus. He has written *An Introduction to the New Testament,* Stockholm, 1951, in which Prof. Anton Fridrichsen has contributed "The History of the Canon," and Prof. Harald Riesenfeld "The History of the Text." He is also the author of *A Handbook of the Bible,* Stockholm, 1952, as well as of many shorter articles. The present volume is the first in a series which is intended to trace the idea of creation in the theology of the church down to the present.

This first volume covers the doctrine of creation in the Old Testament, the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, Philo, and the New Testament. The concepts which receive attention are creation, the idea of God, monotheism, universalism, the elect people, the elect individual (Messiah), the new creation, the Son of Man, etc. In the Old Testament, God is the creator of all that exists, and therefore sovereign Lord and ruler of all. But he is also the God of the chosen people. He has selected them for himself, and ratified the election in the covenants, especially at Sinai. Throughout the Old Testament there is a tension between these two conceptions—the universal, creation, and the particular, election. The solution of this tension is sought in the idea of election for service. This is the development reached in Second Isaiah. The remnant, which is incorporated in the Suffering Servant and in the Son of Man in Daniel, is the instrument through whom God will accomplish his purpose.

The author finds that in the Old Testament and in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha there are two different types of religious world view—the ethical and the soteriological. The ethical is monistic and optimistic, resting on the divine order of the world. The soteriological is dualistic and pessimistic, regards this world as doomed, and waits for a new creation. Since both, however, held to the idea of merits of good works and divided the people into the pious and the evil, there could be no pure conception of soteriology.

In the New Testament these ideas which

had been foreshadowed in the past are developed and fused together into a unity. Jesus is the agent in creation and redemption; he is the present and active Lord and the coming Son of Man who fulfills all history and is the agent of the new creation. With him the new creation is both present and future. The tension between the universal (creation) and the particular (election) remains, but it is resolved to some extent as he creates a new, universal people of God and they realize the purpose of election in the mission of the church. The difference between the Old and the New Testament is that in the New Testament Christ is the center and "christology is the theme of the New Testament" (p. 168).

The list of literature is very impressive. It is particularly noticeable that the author is well acquainted with English and American works, and frequently refers to them in the text. We are indebted to the author for giving us a brief and yet comprehensive account of the idea of creation in biblical literature. We hope that the second volume will soon be available.

ERIC H. WAHLSTROM